CA1 CC 8 -73S76 Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2022 with funding from University of Toronto







SUBSIDY PATTERNS FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS IN CANADA

by
Frank T. Pasquill,
Programme in Arts Administration
of York University

Canada Canada Council
EGeneral publications, 16-67



-73576

SUBSIDY PATTERNS FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS IN CANADA

Ву

Frank T. Pasquill

Report of a Study Conducted by the

Programme in Arts Administration, York University,

Under the Direction of Professor D. Paul Schafer

February 1973

Published and distributed by Canada Council Information Services P.O. Box 1047, Ottawa, K1P 5V8

Price: \$1.25

District Tomas

The second

FOREWORD

This report, commissioned by the Canada Council, was prepared by the Programme in Arts Administration at York University under the direction of Professor D. Paul Schafer. The conclusions and recommendations it contains are entirely those of the authors, and do not necessarily coincide with the views of the Canada Council. The report is being distributed by the Council in order to stimulate informed discussion of the growing emergency in the financing of the performing arts in Canada.

J. Norman Lamont, Chief, Research and Analysis Section.

André Fortier, Director.

Canada Council.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was conducted by the Programme in Arts Administration of York University, under the direction of Professor D. Paul Schafer, and with the assistance of The Canada Council.

The Donner Canadian Foundation is also acknowledged for its assistance in establishing the original data base from which the analysis proceeded.

Finally, the author wishes to thank his co-researchers, Susan Crean and Joan Horsman, and the key policymakers who spared valuable time for an interview.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
MAJOR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
FUNDING AGENCIES AND INTERVIEWS	
The Performing Arts Federal Agencies Provincial Agencies Municipal Agencies Corporations Foundations	9 10 13 29 37 43
ANALYSIS OF FUNDING PATTERNS	
An International Model Data Base Analysis By Art Form Professional/Non-Professional Dimension Geographic Cultural Disparities Relative Support Patterns Analysis of Private Funding Projection of Trends Individual Artists Concluding Remarks	48 54 56 59 62 63 66 70 72 74
APPENDIX A	

Interview Participants Municipal Governments Included In Tabulations Organizations Designated as Professional in Analysis

APPENDIX B

Tables I to X

APPENDIX C

Figures I to VIII







The following introductory remarks will define the scope, purpose and format of this report.

SCOPE AND PURPOSE

This document describes and analyzes how the performing arts in Canada are subsidized by the federal government, provincial and municipal governments, corporations, foundations and individuals. It concerns itself only with grants that help arts organizations bring opera, music, dance and theatre before a live audience. The mass media and government programmed activity, with a few exceptions, fall outside this definition of the performing arts.

The issue addressed herein is not why the performing arts require subsidies, but how various patrons allocate their support. We feel that the rationale for subsidies was firmly established in 1966 by Professors W.J. Baumol and W.G. Bowen in their book Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma. We simply accept that the performing arts, because of their high cost of human involvement, cannot benefit from major technological economies of scale or specialization.

A Crisis in the Arts, published by the Canadian Conference of the Arts in 1968, and the recent report to The Canada Council by Vincent W. Bladen both analyzed the finances of several large performing arts organizations and argued convincingly for their greater public subsidization. This study attempts to go further by analyzing the funding of all Canadian performing arts organizations. Our purpose is to indicate how funding patterns have formed over the past two years and to examine the implications of these patterns.

FORMAT

With such wide terms of reference, this report necessarily deals with a large and unwieldy data base. Hopefully, we have assisted comprehension of this information by providing both detailed and aggregated figures. However, to improve readability, the document is designed like a pyramid, with the reader encouraged to descend from a simple apex to the complex base.

The first section, "Major Conclusions and Recommendations", is stripped of detail and is the reader's clearest vantage point. However, to support these statements we must move in the direction of increased complexity.

The section entitled "Funding Agencies and Interviews" is a brief description of each funding source and the policies of the key officials interviewed. Their comments are particularly useful in explaining trends in the performing arts funding patterns.

The last major section, "Analysis of Funding Patterns", begins by briefly outlining an international model with which to contrast and compare the Canadian situation. We consider such dimensions as time, art form, professionalism, geography, and source of support. After an examination of private funding, a projection of trends and an analysis of subsidy for individual artists, this section concludes with remarks supporting the recommendations and conclusions presented earlier.

Appended to the body of the report the reader will find various lists, tables of figures and graphic illustrations of funding trends. By relegating these materials to the base of our pyramid, we hope the tedium of statistics has been alleviated for the casual reader.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS



These major conclusions and recommendations result primarily from an intensive analysis of public and private funding patterns of the performing arts in Canada, as well as from numerous interviews with public and private authorities across the country. Additional information collected by York's Programme in Arts Administration on international cultural policies, practices and expenditures, Canadian cultural policies, and problems of performing arts organizations in Canada have permitted the placement of these conclusions and recommendations within a contemporary cultural context.

1. THE PERFORMING ARTS IN CANADA

In total, the performing arts in Canada are in an unhealthy situation. Many performing arts organizations in the country suffer from serious administrative and artistic constraints which, in part, result from a lack of requisite funding or unstable financial conditions. Although administrative procedures have been tightened and financial pressures somewhat alleviated for a number of major "professional" performing arts companies over the past decade, rapidly escalating costs continue to threaten the financial stability of the large performing arts organizations. At the same time, numerous aspiring performing arts organizations continue to need the financial assistance necessary for artistic growth, creative development and administrative efficiency.

Even apart from cost considerations and threatening inflationary pressures, it is estimated that total public and private subsidy for the performing arts in Canada must grow to \$32.5 million by 1974-1975 if past growth is to be extended at the same rate into the future.

2. GENERAL PATTERNS AND TRENDS

The Canada Council effectively sets both the pattern and the scale for <u>all</u> public and private subsidization of the performing arts in Canada. Although grants from provincial and municipal governments, corporations, foundations and private sources are smaller in absolute amount, these donors tend to follow the pattern of The Canada Council's allocation of funds: they subsidize roughly the <u>same group of performing arts organizations</u> and devote approximately the <u>same relative proportion of their total budgets</u> to these performing arts companies. Where effective methods for adjudication and evaluation are lacking, these funding agencies use The Canada Council grants to performing arts organizations to ascertain standards of artistic quality, financial need and general cultural contribution to the community.

3. A POLICY FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Due to this dominance of The Canada Council in the performing arts field, it is recommended that the Council prepare and articulate a policy for the performing arts in Canada in a manner similar to the Secretary of State's policy formulations for museums, publishing and film. Regardless of whether this policy is released by The Canada Council or the Secretary of State, it must be developed in conjunction with performing arts organizations, performing artists, and other funding and administrative agencies.

Recent Canadian and international trends indicate an increasing predominance of technological transmission of cultural expression as compared with live cultural expression. A dynamic performing arts policy would do a great deal to enhance human interaction between performing artists and actual and potential audiences.

In addition, although The Canada Council sets the general patterns and relative scale of funding for the performing arts in Canada, it is obvious that a performing arts policy would do a great deal to eliminate the considerable confusion that exists in public and private sectors across the country over how The Canada Council determines its subsidization policies for the performing arts.

4. NATIONAL PERFORMING ARTS ASSETS

Since 1945, several performing arts organizations in Canada have achieved national and international significance. In effect, these organizations have become national arts assets and have done a great deal to strengthen national unity at home and enhance Canada's cultural image abroad. It is recommended that these organizations be identified as national arts assets by the federal government and that formulae for financing these organizations be worked out mutually by the organizations and federal authorities to cover general increases in appropriations, special projects and commissions, long-term planning, and deficits incurred on contemporary experimental works. This recommendation is consistent with the way in which national performing arts assets are financed in most European countries.

It is also recommended that either a special appropriation be provided to The Canada Council to meet the financial needs of these national arts assets or that the federal government assume direct responsibility for these organizations, thereby relieving The Canada Council of its financial obligations in this area.

In either case, if The Canada Council is not relieved of the burden of funding these national arts assets out of its normal budget, many performing arts needs at other levels and in other areas will not be met and the performing arts in Canada will not emerge as a fully-developed cultural force.

5. EXAMINATION OF PRECEDENTS

During the last decade, flesh has been added to the performing arts skeleton in Canada through the establishment of many smaller performing arts organizations in theatre, music, opera and dance. The analysis indicates that the Local Initiatives Programme and the Opportunities for Youth Programme have also stimulated activity in previously neglected areas of the performing arts. It is recommended that The Canada Council re-examine its precedents concerning subsidy for only "professional" arts organizations and that full consideration be given to providing financial assistance to those performing arts organizations that are aspiring to professional excellence in terms of artistic quality and creativity.

6. SUPPORT FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CANADIAN WORKS

Recent changes in cultural activity in Canada indicate that both within performing arts organizations and among audiences there is a growing interest in innovative and indigenous forms of expression in the performing arts. It is recommended that The Canada Council undertake an intensive examination of this interest in innovative and Canadian experimental works and consider the feasibility of allocating special funds for these purposes. Here again, this recommendation is consistent with established practices in many European countries.

7. SUPPORT FOR INDIVIDUAL CREATIVE ARTISTS

Without doubt, The Canada Council is emulated internationally for both the methods it has employed and the amount that

it has devoted to the support of artists as individuals. Although it was not possible to conduct an intensive investigation in this area, it is recommended that The Canada Council undertake a detailed examination of the social, economic and legal conditions affecting individual artists in the performing arts in Canada. Particular consideration should be given to aspiring creative and performing artists and the fundamental problems that all artists in the performing arts experience in the performance and distribution of their work.

8. REGIONAL PERFORMING ARTS DISPARITIES

The analysis reveals a great disparity in the provincial or regional distribution of performing arts activity across the country. Although greater liaison with other public and private cultural agencies would help to eliminate some of the severe disparities between various provinces and regions, it is recommended that The Canada Council examine its policies in this area and encourage a more even geographic distribution of financial resources to the performing arts in Canada. Presumably, this should form an integral part of an effective performing arts policy.

9. GOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION AND COOPERATION

It is recommended that greater consideration be given to coordination and cooperation between The Canada Council and provincial and municipal governments. Although provincial funding of the performing arts has increased dramatically in recent years, the analysis

reveals a perpetual shortage of municipal support and encouragement for the performing arts. This is most inconsistent with financial patterns of support for the performing arts by municipal governments in Europe. Although there is a significant difference in the municipal tax bases in Europe as compared with those in Canada, it is recommended that The Canada Council initiate discussions with municipal authorities in Canada's major urban centres concerning both financial support for performing arts organizations and effective methods for evaluating grant requests at the municipal level.

10. PRIVATE SUPPORT FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Although there has been an absolute increase in private financial support for the performing arts in Canada during the last decade, private support has dramatically decreased in relative terms, from an estimated 34% in 1963-1964 to 15% in 1970-1971. Here again, if The Canada Council is concerned with maintaining a judicious balance between public and private sources of support, discussions should be initiated between The Canada Council and major corporations, foundations and private donors.

FUNDING AGENCIES AND INTERVIEWS



This section traces the historical development of Canadian performing arts organizations and describes the funding agencies which contributed to this growth. Comments from interviews conducted with key policymakers in the performing arts (Appendix A) have been included since they help to explain the funding patterns revealed in the next section. Although a set of guidelines was used to gain some consistency, these interviews took the form of open-ended discussions and helped to uncover previously unrecognized issues.

THE PERFORMING ARTS

The major impetus for the performing arts in Canada came from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The creation of the National Film Board in 1939 provided additional opportunities for employment, and the media continue to be a major source of revenue for musicians, actors and artistic directors. However, the live performing arts (opera, music, dance and theatre) have experienced most of their development since World War II. The Winnipeg Ballet Club gave its first performance in 1939 and achieved professional status in 1949. Opera was produced in Montreal as early as 1941, but it did not appear in Toronto, Vancouver or Edmonton until after 1945.

But significant growth in live performance has occurred only recently. The establishment of The Canada Council in 1957 provided the support and encouragement to enable professional groups to grow from adolescence to maturity and to develop a strong core of activity, including a considerable amount of national and international touring. At the same time, numerous smaller organizations have been encouraged to develop.

An analysis of this growth is a study in itself, $\binom{1}{1}$ and our purpose is to focus on the parallel growth of funding agencies. Although the following description is very brief, a more comprehensive treatment is available in other research documents. $\binom{2}{1}$

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Although our interviews were directed only towards provincial, municipal and private funding agencies, our analysis also includes certain federal agencies, particularly The Canada Council, the National Arts Centre Corporation and the Department of the Secretary of State.

⁽¹⁾ Crean, Susan M. Who's Afraid of Canadian Culture!
Programme in Arts Administration.

Horsman, Joan and Pasquill, Frank. <u>Cultural Funding</u>
Patterns in Canada. Programme in Arts Administration.

THE CANADA COUNCIL

One of the foremost recommendations of the 1949 Massey Commission was to establish a government-supported body which would assist voluntary efforts in the arts, humanities and social sciences; to foster Canada's cultural relationships abroad; and to perform the functions of the National Commission for Unesco. In accordance with this recommendation, the federal government passed The Canada Council Act in 1957, whereby the Council consists of a chairman, vice-chairman and not more than nineteen other members appointed by the Governor-in-Council for five-year and three-year terms.

Although the Council was originally established with a \$50 million endowment fund, income is presently derived from three sources: earnings from the endowment, an annual appropriation from parliament, and funds from private donors used in accordance with their wishes. With freedom to set its own policies and to make its own decisions within the terms of the Act, the Council has devised a broad programme of assistance to performing arts organizations and individual artists through grants, awards and bursaries.

The Canada Council expenditures listed in its 1961-1962 to 1970-1971 annual reports provide a major input to our analysis.

THE NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE CORPORATION

The Massey Report also observed that interest in serious music had greatly increased in Canada. However, the people who benefitted least from this increased interest were Canada's creative and interpretive artists. The Report concluded that serious music by Canadian composers and musicians was virtually unknown and that our stages

were largely dominated by the performing arts of Europe or the United States. The solution as proposed by the Commission was a complex one, but prime requirements included the development of facilities for performance, the promotion of Canadian music, dance, opera and drama, and the organization of tours for Canadian artistic companies and concert artists.

In 1966, as part of the preparation for Canada's centennial celebrations, parliament passed the National Arts Centre Act, creating the National Arts Centre Corporation. Its objectives included: the operation and maintenance of the National Arts Centre, which opened in 1969; the development of the performing arts in the Ottawa region; and assistance to The Canada Council in the development of the performing arts across Canada.

In its third year of operation, the Corporation established six guiding principles to be reflected in the Centre's programming: quality, creativity, variety, accessibility, Canadian content and cultural balance. Its main programme includes music, opera, dance, English and French theatre, popular entertainment, youth programming, radio and television broadcasts from the Centre, film programmes and touring arrangements for Canadian groups.

Although the Centre's activities include the media arts, its annual appropriation from parliament is included in our analysis.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The Department of the Secretary of State is often unofficially called canada's "Ministry of Culture". In effect, the Department simply handles those matters within the jurisdiction of the federal government that are not assigned to any other department. It controls the National Film Board and exercises certain discretionary powers over the Canadian Radio-Television Commission, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Canadian Film

Development Corporation and the National Museums of Canada. In addition, it acts as spokesman in parliament for The Canada Council and the National Arts Centre Corporation.

The Department maintains a Cultural Support Branch to assist with the development of Federal cultural policies and to process grant applications of certain national organizations that fall outside the concern of other funding agencies.

PROVINCIAL AGENCIES

In chronological order, the prime bodies at the provincial level with responsibility for cultural development are: The Alberta Cultural Development Branch (1946); the Saskatchewan Arts Board (1949); Quebec Department of Cultural Affairs (1961); The Province of Ontario Council for the Arts (1963); the Manitoba Arts Council (1965); the British Columbia Centennial Cultural Fund Committee (1967).

Although New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island do not yet have specific legislation authorizing financial assistance for artists and cultural organizations, each provides some form of support.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Prior to 1967, grants to arts organizations were made directly from the Provincial Treasury. However, the Centennial Cultural Fund Act, passed in 1967, specified that a \$5 million endowment be established in the Provincial Treasury and that the interest be used to stimulate cultural development within the province. In 1969, the endowment was raised to \$10 million and in 1971 to \$15 million.

The Act made no provision for the administration of the fund but, at least until the recent change in government, an Advisory Committee composed of the Speaker of the House, the Deputy Provincial Minister and three Ministers without portfolio has been responsible for the distribution of funds. To date, the Committee has not attempted to assess quality itself but has relied instead on The Canada Council's grant allocations to provide guidelines for its own grants to performing arts organizations and individuals.

In a report based on a survey conducted in the summer of 1971, Professor D. Paul Schafer recommended that a permanent staff be hired to administrate the fund. However, during our interview, the chairman of the Committee indicated that he wished to discuss alternative structures with his committee and with representatives of British Columbia's cultural community before making a final decision.

No grants have been made for arts facilities, research or education, and no influence has been exerted over Canadian content or ticket pricing. Support for dance began in 1970-1971, and assistance for film and cultural exchanges may be available in the future. Otherwise, the present pattern of support will remain relatively constant. Concern was expressed that the federal government should examine the financial position, administration and programming of professional performing arts companies and encourage these organizations to do more national touring.

Had Premier Bennett's party been re-elected, there would have been a good possibility of future additions to the endowment. However, with the change in government, future increases may well take the form of an annual appropriation.

The Advisory Committee has encouraged the formation of over fifty community arts councils throughout the province and has distributed grants to these councils on a per capita formula. Although approximately 20% of the 1970-1971 funds was spent in this manner and might indirectly benefit the performing arts, our analysis only considers the grants made to arts organizations and the support provided to individuals. Consequently, the analysis will tend to slightly underestimate the level of support.

ALBERTA

The Alberta Cultural Development Branch operated under the Department of Economic Affairs from 1946 to 1958 and under the Provincial Secretary from 1959 to 1970. It then became a component part of the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation (created in 1971) where it will continue to hold prime responsibility for the development of music, drama, creative writing, visual arts and provincial libraries.

The Branch's main objectives are to increase audience involvement and to raise the level of appreciation. A large portion of each annual budget is directed to the exposure programmes, leadership training and consultative services provided to communities by a full-time staff and a large number of part-time instructors and artists. Because of its interest in promoting high community involvement, the Branch actively promotes arts education programmes as well as performances by professional groups in schools and community centres.

Its attitude is that if you kill the amateur, then you kill the professional for, as they see it, the performing arts cannot develop without a broad amateur base since public demand for the professional develops out of amateur participation.

The Branch's work is presently directed towards a middle class audience, but future audiences could become more heterogeneous. It has a "hands off" policy towards ticket pricing, but is considering a system whereby credit cards would be issued to all Albertans and grants would then be partially assessed on the number of people who attended an organization's activities.

In support of professional organizations, the Branch has established a grant formula of an automatic 10% of gross operating budget, and it awards travel grants to groups that have been extended an official invitation for cultural exchange. At present, they only support young and unestablished individual talent, but hope to create a special fund for the professional individual. There has been no assistance for capital costs of facilities or the acquisition of equipment. Policies guiding the distribution of funds are not expected to be changed within the near future.

The Branch felt that relationships with The Canada Council could be improved through the establishment of regional offices, since there is presently insufficient information exchange and consultation. For the Branch, a priority for federal funds should be: (1) development of existing western professional organizations; (2) professional training and touring in smaller centres; (3) the formation of a counterpart to the Associated Councils of the Arts. Although it was felt that the federal government should assume approximately 40% of total subsidies and all other levels of support should assume 20% each, it was conceded that some provinces might go as high as 40%. In general, the Branch felt there should be much greater cooperation and coordination between federal, provincial and municipal governments in funding the arts.

Since financial assistance in the form of direct grants and scholarships comprised only about 40% of the 1970-1971 expenditures in the Branch's administration, music and drama divisions, our analysis understates the level of support. Unfortunately, there is no way of determining the extent to which programmed activity and administrative costs actually contributed to the performing arts.

SASKATCHEWAN

The Saskatchewan Arts Board was created by legislation in 1949 as an independent board of not less than seven and not more than fifteen members appointed for a one-year period. The Act made specific provision for an administrative director who was to serve as a board member.

In 1972, the Department of Culture and Youth was created and the Arts Board became responsible to its minister. However, the Board will continue to receive an annual appropriation and retain full authority to make its own funding decisions. The Minister of Culture and Youth felt that the creation of his department was an indication of the present government's belief in multiculturalism and its intention to provide assistance for development in this area. Although high priority will be given to the decentralization and development of activities in rural communities, there is as yet no clear idea of tactics. The first year will be spent in hiring people and undertaking studies of the existing ethnic groups and resources in Saskatchewan. The 1972-1973 budget includes approximately \$100,000 for this research.

The Saskatchewan Arts Board's emphasis has been on the elevation of standards. Grants have been directed mainly to organizations working towards professional status while smaller communities have been served by professional touring groups such as the Overture Concerts and Jeunesses Musicales. The Board encourages organizations

to work within schools, develop youth training programmes and give special youth concerts.

In regard to the methods of developing new audiences, it was felt that ticket pricing policies should be the domain of the organizations concerned, but that if prices were to sky-rocket at some point then the Board might intervene. At present, some organizations provide free tickets to special groups such as senior citizens.

The Saskatchewan Festival of the Arts was one major attempt to reach smaller communities, and the Board hopes that new methods may be developed to ensure that performances and workshops are available to a larger number of towns. Individual support is expected to steadily increase over the next few years since the Board is particularly concerned with young and unestablished people. Also anticipated is a more equal distribution of grants between professional and amateur activities. The main amateur projects in music will be the further development of the Saskatchewan Youth Orchestra, the Saskatchewan Youth Band and the Saskatchewan Youth Chorus. It is hoped that these groups will make a major tour outside the province on an alternate basis each year in addition to the present programme of touring to several Saskatchewan towns. The Board was concerned with the cost of touring groups to small centres and suggested that this might be a prime area for greater federal assistance.

The Saskatchewan Summer School of the Arts offers two-to-three-week training courses, primarily for young people. The Saskatchewan Festival of the Arts, recently discontinued, presented performances and exhibitions in numerous Saskatchewan communities. Again, since these activities were planned and organized by staff members, the expenditures cannot be included along with the grants to arts organizations and awards to individuals. However, since the programmes included expenditures for the visual arts as well as the performing arts, the performing arts expenditures would probably only amount to about \$50,000 in 1970-1971, or roughly 60% of direct support.

MANITOBA

Although the Act establishing the Manitoba Arts Council was passed in 1965, the Council did not begin full operation until fiscal year 1969-1970. The Council's Board consists of twelve members appointed for three-year terms by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

The Council's position within the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs is not expected to change within the next few years. At present, the Department subsidizes the operation of the Centennial Concert Hall, whereas the Council provides direct grants to arts organizations. The Council acts as an advisor to the City of Winnipeg regarding its distribution of grants to cultural groups.

The Council's emphasis is on quality, standards and increased accessibility to the arts. Reflecting these concerns, the points considered in evaluating applications include: (1) budget control and administrative practices; (2) accessibility of services to all citizens; (3) extension of programmes to all parts of the province; (4) use and employment of Manitoba talent; (5) good working relations with parallel organizations, school boards, etc.; (6) work with youth; (7) effective public relations programmes in relation to actual performance.

The Director of the Council felt that Winnipeg audiences were presently fairly heterogeneous, but an actual audience profile had not been carried out. The larger Winnipeg organizations are still more concerned with artistic standards than with audience development but are gradually developing new "outreach" programmes and are encouraged to tour. The Council hopes to level off grants to the large-scale professional organizations and direct more funds to amateur activities.

The Council hopes to establish a separate \$100,000 lottery fund for assistance to individuals not presently served by The Canada Council. To help develop audiences,

the Council encourages organizations to provide free performances to certain underprivileged people, such as the handicapped, senior citizens, etc. Physical location of performances was felt to be of prime importance.

The Council has no plans to set regulations regarding Canadian or contemporary content, although it might exert gentle pressure on grant recipients to consider developing indigenous works. Ethnic activity and northern development are high priorities. Although Winnipeg has very good cultural facilities, an advisory committee is soon to be appointed by the provincial government to determine the capital and operating funding requirements for ethnic cultural activities. It was felt that the federal government should be responsible for the major cost of cultural development and that the respective roles of the Secretary of State and The Canada Council need to be clarified.

In summary, present priorities include northern development, establishment of better information channels, touring by professional companies, amateur activity and ethnic cultural development.

ONTARIO

The Ontario Arts Council, an independent body resembling the Manitoba and Saskatchewan funding agencies, was established by legislation in 1963 and located under the Department of Education. After the release of the Draft Report of the Ontario Commission on Post-Secondary Education, the Council, together with the Ontario Science Centre, the Art Gallery of Ontario, the Ontario College of Art, the Royal Botanical Gardens, the Royal Ontario Museum and the Ontario Heritage Foundation, was moved under the Department of University Affairs. In turn, the Department of University Affairs,

the Department of Community and Social Development, and the Departments of Health and Education are coordinated by the Provincial Secretary.

This organizational change reflects the Commission's recommendation that cultural organizations be considered part of post-secondary education. The only cultural agencies that are not now consolidated under the Department of University Affairs are the Cultural Exchange Programme, located within the Department of Education, and the Youth and Recreation Branch, located within the Department of Community and Social Development. The implications of this change have not yet been fully realized, but the government's present concern is to establish policies on cultural development since it anticipates a strong growth in public interest in the arts.

The Ontario Arts Council consists of twelve private citizens appointed for three-year terms. It is entrusted with the responsibility of promoting the study, enjoyment, production and performance of works in the arts, and is empowered to dispense grants, loans and scholarships.

The Council has a very broad support pattern, including the use of media, arts education, arts research and programmed activities. It has a positive attitude towards Canadian content, touring, amateur support and awards to creative artists, but any change in its present funding pattern will depend upon future appropriations. It hopes to continue its present growth rate and triple its budget within the next five years.

The upsurge of interest in the arts by youth, stimulated partly by LIP and OFY, has placed the Council under great pressure. It has recently received requests which are completely unrealistic in comparison with past funding practices and, although it would like to help develop standards of quality within these emerging groups, it feels that careful coordination with the federal

government is required to prevent funding that is incongruent with the level of artistic achievement.

Our analysis includes direct grants from the Department of Education, the Ontario Arts Council and the Cultural Exchange Programme, but it does not account for the programmed activities of the Youth and Recreation Branch. The analysis therefore underestimates the level of support in Ontario, but since the Youth and Recreation Branch did not begin its touring programme "Summer Sounds" or to fund Theatre Ontario and Ontario Youth Theatre until fiscal year 1971-1972 the resulting error will not be significant.

QUEBEC

The Quebec Department of Cultural Affairs was created in 1961 and presently has an immense scope of operations, including divisions in French language, cultural relations, arts and letters, music, cultural expansion, theatre, libraries, historic monuments and film.

The main concerns of the Department regarding the performing arts are: (1) support for the production of art products and processes; (2) provision of facilities; (3) support of creators; (4) formation of cultural awareness through education; (5) conservation.

Because of the long existence of the programme and its great levels of support, the Department has been able to affect some factors which promote greater involvement of audiences. For example, grants are sometimes made conditional on a certain programme being included in the activity of an organization. The Department is presently undertaking a study that will hopefully rearrange the existing structure, lower administrative costs and provide greater assistance to less established

organizations. It has recognized that larger organizations have been awarded an increasing proportion of funds and efforts are being made to counteract this tendency.

This report is concerned only with the Department's direct support of individuals and organizations involved in cultural exchange, diffusion and other activities related to opera, music, dance and theatre. Since we ignore programmed and educational activities in the Conservatories of Music and Theatre, our analysis will underestimate the level of support in Quebec.

NEW BRUNSWICK

In 1967, the Office of Cultural Affairs was established in the Office of the Premier by Order-in-Council. Its functions were to promote the study, enjoyment and production of the performing and visual arts, literary arts and crafts; to assist, cooperate with and enlist the aid of organizations with similar objectives; and to provide grants and scholarships for the study, research and development of the arts in the province. The Handicrafts Branch, which had been in operation since 1946, was incorporated into this Office, where it continued to direct its efforts to developing cottage craft industries in New Brunswick and to teaching crafts as a cultural and recreational activity.

In 1969, a conference was held to draft policy recommendations on provincial involvement in the arts, but a change in government halted further progress. A Grants Committee, made up of a chairman and three senior civil servants, then assumed responsibility for funding the performing arts. At present, applications from performing arts groups are considered along with all other provincial organizations. Since the Grants Committee does not have an arts development policy, the performing arts have lost

considerable ground and compete rather unsuccessfully for the annual \$300,000 appropriation.

There is no intention to fund individuals, provide arts facilities, or move into programming. Although professional groups are not favoured over amateurs, there is some bias towards organizations which have wide provincial involvement.

At some time there may be a revival of the Cultural Affairs Office since Quebec and New Brunswick are interested in developing cultural exchanges. The major argument against a separate arts council is that a full-time staff cannot be justified with the present low level of activity. The formation of an Atlantic or Maritime arts council might overcome this problem if it could be established through the cooperation of the provinces.

In summary, it can be concluded that, with the exception of Theatre New Brunswick which derives a large portion of its support from the Beaverbrook Foundation, the performing arts are in the initial stages of development within the province. Since the New Brunswick Symphony merged with the Atlantic Symphony, interest in classical music at the local level has been somewhat diminished, and it would appear that New Brunswick's only other assets are its high quality handicrafts. There may be some stimulation of the performing arts through recent LIP and OFY grants, but no significant changes in the near future can be expected.

NOVA SCOTIA

Nova Scotia has no specific legislation authorizing financial assistance to performing arts organizations, but nevertheless the Department of Education and the Department of Finance and Economics do provide grants

to a number of groups. The Government of Nova Scotia has recently given active consideration to the establishment of a centralized funding system for cultural organizations and has considered various alternatives, including: (1) a grants committee similar to the one in New Brunswick to be responsible for all discretionary grants ordered by government; (2) an endowment fund similar to the British Columbia Centennial Cultural Fund; (3) an independent governmentfunded arts council; (4) the creation of a separate department of cultural affairs. It appears that a decision in favour of the first alternative has been made, with four deputy ministers making up the committee. However, this development cannot be considered favourable to the arts since it will probably result in the same lack of cultural priorities that exists in New Brunswick.

The Departments presently involved in funding the arts see their objectives as being: (1) the provision of facilities to help communities develop cultural activities; (2) the elimination of cultural disparities.

Although the structure of the present funding is somewhat disorganized, it was felt that the arts have a fairly high priority for future governmental expenditures and that the trend towards increased support will likely continue. It was pointed out that the Maritime premiers have agreed to coordinate the funding of universities through the Maritime Universities Finance Committee, and it was felt that a Maritime arts council could be formed with the same kind of cooperation.

Although it was recognized that the federal OFY and LIP projects had great beneficial effects on the artistic community of Nova Scotia, it was felt that they had raised expectations for change too high. It was also suggested that matching grants might be one way of establishing community commitment.

Finally, it was felt that a national cultural policy to coordinate the funding of various agencies would help the arts fulfill two important roles: the creation of a national identity and the development of social cohesion.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Prince Edward Island's Department of Education has no formulated cultural policy and most grants are distributed on an <u>ad hoc</u> basis. A finance committee bases its decisions on precedent and there is very little support given to the arts except for an annual grant to the Confederation Centre.

The Centre was constructed under federal charter and upon completion was turned over to the Fathers of Confederation Building Trust. Since the operation of the Centre's library is financed separately, this report assumes that operating grants from the Department of the Secretary of State and the Government of Prince Edward Island are in direct support of the performing arts in general.

The development of the arts in Prince Edward Island has been helped a great deal by the Centre, but a low population base and scarce resources make progress difficult. Prince Edward Island is a closely-knit, family-related community, and the social aspects of the arts are not considered to be important. Consequently, the Centre operates mainly during the summer when tourists supplement the Island's population.

Although Prince Edward Island gets more than its share of federal support, it was felt that The Canada Council's emphasis on professionalism worked against the Maritimes in general. It was recognized that a Maritimes arts council might be of some benefit, but it was pointed out that P.E.I. residents are primarily Islanders rather than Maritimers and that any such council would have to cope with problems of communication, differing tax bases and different stages of development.

NEWFOUNDLAND

The Province of Newfoundland has provided encouragement for its cultural growth by the establishment of several

arts and culture centres. At present, St. John's, Corner Brook and Grand Falls each have, or shortly will have, completed facilities.

Newfoundland is faced with the peculiar situation of having elaborate facilities without its own professional groups. Travel assistance grants from The Canada Council have enabled the province to place such companies as the Canadian Opera, the Royal Winnipeg Ballet and the Atlantic Symphony into these centres and to keep the price of tickets at an economic level.

To help develop standards of quality in local groups, The Canada Council has also provided professional directors for the amateur theatre companies that perform during the St. John's Summer Festival of the Arts. The director of the festival hopes to broaden this into workshop sessions whereby local amateur theatre groups can take advantage of professional training. Grass roots development is also encouraged by the provision of technical facilities at very low rental rates, which are often written off entirely. Although one cannot expect to see the development of professional companies when there are so many other areas of need, one organization that might develop is the St. John's Symphony Society, which grew out of a Memorial University Extension Service programme.

Unlike Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland's cultural centres do not receive a great amount of publicity through its Department of Tourism, which promotes a "hunting and fishing" image to the mainland. Consequently, although tourism in general is impeded by difficult access to the mainland, an unfavourable climate and cold, rocky beaches, the province is failing to reach this potential arts audience and to derive maximum use of its facilities.

Since the various centres' art galleries are handled by Memorial University, the libraries by the Provincial Libraries Board and the maintenance by Public Works, this report assumes that appropriations from the Department of Provincial Affairs are of direct benefit to the performing arts in general. It is not assumed to be programmed activity because grants to the National Arts Centre and the Confederation Centre have similarly been included in our analysis.

SUMMARY OF PROVINCIAL AGENCY INTERVIEWS

Most provincial agencies appear to have progressed in some form or another towards addressing the question of cultural policy, and they are beginning to shift towards more amateur and individual support. The Maritime provinces, however, are not yet sufficiently organized to consider how to best develop their performing arts assets.

It would appear that all provinces are concerned about the funding of arts organizations through LIP and OFY, particularly if newly formed organizations approach the provinces for continued support. There is very little communication among the provinces and with other levels of funding about such problems, and it was often stated that there needs to be a clear articulation of what The Canada Council's policies are, what the cultural policy of the nation might be, and what role the provinces might play in its formulation and implementation.

MUNICIPAL AGENCIES

In the previous section, each province was considered separately because the scope of operations warranted special attention. However, the number of city officials interviewed makes it necessary for us to restrict this section to general remarks on municipal support.

MUNICIPALITIES AND THE ARTS

Municipalities are authorized by provincial law to make grants to non-profit organizations, but they must limit the aggregate amount of all grants to less than one mill. Similarly, municipal governments are authorized to pass by-laws for the construction, operation and maintenance of arts facilities and to exempt arts organizations from property taxes.

Although this clear mandate has been given to municipalities, most have responded in no more than a perfunctory manner. For example, during Canada's centennial year, some responded to the opportunity of constructing major arts facilities on a cost-sharing basis with the federal and provincial governments, but a full commitment for programming these centres is still forthcoming. On the other hand, many municipalities do extend the property tax exemption and often arts activities form part of library or recreation programmes.

This report tabulates only the grants to private organizations and, consequently, somewhat underestimates the level of locally programmed amateur activity. However, like the programmed activities of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario and Quebec, the inclusion of this support would only confuse the tabulations of grants.

THE MUNICIPAL GRANTS STRUCTURE

There is a multitude of systems employed in processing grant applications, but approval is usually required from a board of control, a grants sub-committee, or the entire city council. Montreal and Calgary are the only important exceptions to this pattern.

In 1956, the Montreal City Council created a permanent committee called the Greater Montreal Council of the Arts. For a term of five years, the City Council appoints committee members, all of whom must have recognized artistic training or administrative experience. The City of Montreal and other municipalities located on the Island are under the jurisdiction of the Arts Council, and each municipality contributes 1% of its municipal sales tax into a fund. Except for a 10% administration allowance, the fund is used entirely for grants to arts organizations.

Similarly, in 1969 the Calgary City Council agreed to the establishment of the Calgary Region Arts Foundation, comprised of people familiar with local arts activities. The Foundation submits an annual budget to the City, receives a lump sum grant, and then distributes the funds accordingly.

In addition to the problems created by the absence of well-defined application procedures, arts organizations are often faced with the complexity of a metro organization. For example, in Metropolitan Toronto, arts organizations may apply either to their own borough or to Metro Council. If they choose the former, they face the possibility of being turned down because of lack of funds, but if they choose Metro Council they can be refused a grant on the grounds that their activities are not Metro-wide in scope. Furthermore, performing arts organizations are often assessed by politicians who are not qualified to judge the organizations in terms of their artistic standards or their cultural contribution to the community.

The establishment of a separate arts council appears to be one effective method of distributing municipal funds

to arts organizations. However, while municipal politicians felt that an advisory group might be useful in aiding them with their decisions, most of them disagreed with the idea of an independent body because they felt a buffer should not be set up between the politicians and the public. They also feared that an arts committee might become too powerful and simply reinforce established arts organizations. Confirming this fear, we found that Montreal gave continuing grants to the "most deserving and experienced" organizations and had little money left for the more innovative and fledgling groups. On the other hand, Toronto's experience with professional advice was that a consultant was of value only if he gave an objective evaluation of each and every application. Only in Vancouver did we find that there was a possibility that an arts committee might be set up. A few years ago, the Vancouver City Council rejected this proposal and decisions continued to be made by a finance committee, requiring a "yes" vote by eight out of eleven city councillors. However, a highly favourable response to a LIP project, coordinated by the Social Planning and Community Development Branch of the City, might put the proposal back into a more favourable light with local politicians. It is hoped that the committee might be made up of members of City Council and outside arts people.

MUNICIPAL RATIONALE FOR THE ARTS

It was very rare to find within municipal governments any stated policy towards the performing arts, and consequently the objectives of their support were never well defined. On the other hand, a great many cities had a rationale for the arts which varied according to each city's stage of development.

For example, many Maritime cities were trying to attract industry and consequently the main rationale was to improve the cultural environment to satisfy corporate

executives and their families. Although Saint John, New Brunswick, is a large, economically-viable seaport community, municipal authorities wish to create a "total environment" since they find it difficult to attract industry because of the lack of a cultural community.

Other cities of similar size used this economic rationale regarding the tourist industry, claiming that the arts give a city an identity which can be promoted abroad. However, as the size of cities increased, we found the rationale became less functionally and economically oriented. We found instead that the reasons were to "create a multi-dimensional man", "to reinforce ethnic identity", "to create social cohesion", "to provide an outlet for human expression", " to create a national identity", and a number of other socially defined reasons. Although the point of view that hockey games were better than the arts in creating social cohesion was expressed by one mayor, there was a general feeling that the arts did have a place with the city.

AUDIENCE DEVELOPMENT

When questioned about the size and composition of performing arts audiences, most municipal officials felt that it was an upper-middle-class audience with an ever-increasing interest from other segments of the population, especially the youth. When questioned about what changes might help to develop audiences, responses were few, but there were enough to form a general pattern.

Regarding ticket pricing, most officials felt that free tickets should be available only to underprivileged groups that could not afford to pay. Regarding the physical location of the performance, there was widespread agreement that the arts should get out of their confined facilities and into open, informal environments where they could appeal to a larger number and variety of people.

Generally speaking, the officials interviewed were slightly in favour of Canadian contemporary content, but usually they showed their Canadian inferiority complex by saying we should not compromise quality.

Without exception, municipalities did not assist individuals because of the difficulty of evaluation. They preferred organizations that had a long-standing reputation within the community, and they were not particularly disposed to new and amateur groups.

In some cases, arts education was considered to be important and grants were made on the condition that recipients had some type of educational programme. Edmonton, for example, felt that the current interest in the professional arts was a result of the fifteen years of work with amateur activities carried out by the Cultural Division of the City's Parks and Recreation Department. In general, arts programmes directly sponsored by municipalities are highly participatory, educational and democratic. Therefore, it seems surprising that when private arts organizations apply for a municipal grant they are often required to have high standards of excellence, a great reputation in the community, other sources of support, a high earned income, an up-to-date administration, and an audited financial statement before they are actively considered for a grant.

CULTURAL FACILITIES

All municipalities interviewed expressed a great deal of interest in cultural facilities. A number of cities, including Halifax, Saint John, Calgary, Edmonton and Kitchener, are in the process of planning some type of cultural centre.

Saint John, for example, passed a motion which claimed top priority on the use of the Department of Regional

Economic Expansion funds for a cultural complex including a museum, library and theatre. Although the municipal representatives thought the Department might rebel at setting this precedent, they pointed out that regional disparity includes cultural activities and that unless Saint John improves this aspect of the community industries will ignore whatever else DREE might do.

In some cases, the municipalities were extremely proud of their centres and realised the financial implications to the community. This applied especially to Charlottetown, Burnaby and Hamilton. On the other hand, Toronto is often embarrassed at having two arts centres, the St. Lawrence Centre, built during centennial year, and the O'Keefe Centre, which was handed over to the municipal government shortly thereafter. The usual question put to the politicians of Toronto is "Why two centres?", and the St. Lawrence Centre is usually looked upon as an unwanted albatross. This negative feeling towards large, palacetype structures was not common, but there was some indication that people were thinking more in terms of people-oriented facilities.

PROBLEMS IN MUNICIPAL SUPPORT

The municipal tax base and its inadequacy in meeting the costs of even the most essential services of a city was the most common topic of conversation in all the interviews. As a partial explanation of the present difficulties, it was pointed out that municipal legislation was initially formulated in a rural age before a high proportion of people lived in cities. Therefore, cities today must service a large percentage of the population but are expected to do so with a very regressive tax base. On the other hand, the provincial governments of P.E.I. and New Brunswick have taken control of the purse strings entirely. This arrangement has alleviated some of the financial burdens of the cities,

but at the same time it has isolated the taxpayer from municipal council members.

However, even if municipalities did successfully lobby for a percentage of the income tax base and restrictions on grants were eliminated, municipalities would still not be particularly skilled at encouraging cultural growth unless new methods for evaluating organizations were introduced. At present, most small arts organizations cannot wield enough political power to obtain an initial grant, and in some cases even the largest professional groups are annually threatened with losing municipal support.

The arts require stable support to develop properly, and city politics are extremely volatile and personal. One example of what can happen in this kind of situation was found in Dartmouth where City Hall recently voted eleven to three against a grant to the Neptune Theatre. This decision was reversed only after a considerable amount of lobbying by the mayor. Similarly, Toronto City Hall's grant to the Toronto Arts Foundation is a controversial issue each year, and it is very possible that some day the grant will be refused. A final example of this antipathy was found in Winnipeg, where the larger organizations have little hope of receiving any increase over the present level of grants provided to them.

Part of the negative feeling towards professional groups occurs because people interested in the arts are very rarely interested in local politics and vice versa. Promotional efforts often go astray when conservative councillors are put off by "ultra modern plays of nudity, sex and political action against the government". Just as municipal officials are stereotyped as "sewers, roads and garbage collection", so arts organizations still fight an "esoteric faggots" image. All of this suggests that the arts need to communicate more, not only with the mayors but also with councillors and the community at large. Otherwise, the arts will continue to win their support by influencing only a few, admittedly key, politicians, and may thereby expose themselves to financial disaster.

The majority of politicians preferred a free hand in distributing funds, but thought that matching or formula grants might stimulate a rearrangement of priorities and give credibility to some organizations. In terms of a formula, a 50/30/20 split between the federal, provincial and municipal governments was the usual ratio quoted.

It was found that some municipalities felt blackmailed by large arts organizations and by other levels of government. Councillors rarely have any contact with The Canada Council, and the only information regarding policy comes from organizations that often claim municipal grants are required in order to maintain their support from other agencies.

Animosity became greater as we moved geographically away from Ottawa, and it seemed there was deep resentment over the centralization of activity and funding in Ontario. Consequently, reaction to LIP-funded arts activities was generally favourable. The biggest problem was the lack of coordination, which often led to duplication of effort and damage to existing organizations.

One notable exception to this occurred in Vancouver where the municipality handled a \$165,000 LIP grant and brought a very successful arts programme to the community at large. The director of the Vancouver Social Development Branch felt that cultural planning was one of the most important fields of urban development. Municipalities might not know too much about the arts, but they do know about the community, its needs and what kind of arts activity are best suited to the community. Although this particular success with the LIP grant serves as an example of how municipal governments can become more involved in arts activities, it should be recognized that key factors for success are people with combined entrepreneurial, artistic and administrative ability.

From our survey we conclude that the only city not concerned one way or another about the arts is Ottawa, where the reaction was "why shoot off a cap gun when you are surrounded by cannons?".

FUTURE SUPPORT PATTERNS

Any real growth in municipal support for the performing arts will be limited by lack of funds and by provincial restrictions. Although some professional organizations are in a perilous situation regarding future increases in their grants, smaller groups should be able to look forward to increased assistance, continuing tax relief, provision of facilities, and perhaps even being hired to do municipal programming.

CORPORATIONS

The most recent Corporate Financial Statistics indicated that in 1969 there were 207,424 corporations in Canada, with total assets of about \$212 billion and total profits before taxes of over \$10 billion. However, 40% of these profits were made by just 229 of the largest corporations. These large corporations were also the most important sources of corporate philanthropy.

SUPPORT FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Corporate donations for 1969-1970 fiscal year were recorded as \$70.2 million or about .79% of before-taxes profits. Although ten years ago this stood at about 1.38%, a recent survey of the Conference Board indicates

that operating grants to cultural organizations have increased from about 1.8% to their present level of 3.5% of total donations during the same time period. Consequently, by excluding the visual arts, we have estimated that performing arts organizations presently receive about 2.6% of total corporate philanthropy.

This report concerns itself only with direct grants to arts organizations, but recognizes that business organizations often indirectly support the arts through the purchase of season tickets for clients or employees, sponsorship of music festivals or theatrical programmes, and the design, layout and production of season programmes for various arts organizations. It should also be noted that senior executives are often recruited to raise money for arts organizations and that this time may represent a substantially greater contribution than the companies' direct grants.

The reasons given for corporate philanthropy include community responsibility, public relations, indirect company benefit and tax savings. However, the chief reason for corporate giving might well be that senior executives or customers often become conscientiously attached to a particular cause and then use their influence with the company to win support for the cause. Another form of influence is reciprocal giving, which occurs when senior executives are recruited for leading roles in different fund-raising drives and trade solicitations.

EVALUATION AND PROCESSING OF APPLICATIONS

Regardless of size, most companies make donations on an appreciable scale and consequently require budgetary controls. Numerous factors enter into determining the budget for each year, but some of these include: (1) the previous year's giving; (2) company earnings before and after taxes; (3) the sum of expected appeals; (4) the giving of other companies; (5) the number of employees, sales volume, etc.

The trend is towards establishing a formally constituted contributions committee. Even when only one executive is placed in charge, he is usually involved in consultation with other chief executives. The duties of a committee typically include budget preparation, coordination of the company's policies within their divisions, screening and reviewing requests, keeping systematic records, directly authorizing small donations and making recommendations for board approval on larger requests.

In evaluating requests for support, investigation is usually a selective process that focuses on organizations soliciting support for the first time, particularly when the decision will set a precedent. Recurrent appeals already approved and supported from year to year only require fresh consideration when there is a change in the size of the request. The extent of investigation varies with the character of the organization and the amount contributed, but federated appeals are usually well sponsored and publicized and their credentials are taken for granted. Similarly, building campaigns by well-known hospitals and universities command confidence because of their public reputation, and contributing companies usually have no desire to look into their administration. Requests from arts organizations are usually of such a small magnitude that little investigation is required.

Donative policies of companies with operations in several communities are complicated by the wide variety of local obligations. Such companies are often criticized for their failure to distribute support evenly and, in order to gain consistency, most corporate giving is a head office function. However, in some cases, local managers are granted freedom of decision within discretionary limits.

INNOVATIVE GIVING AND THE ARTS

In our interviews, most executives expressed an awareness of social responsibility, a concern with the quality of life, and fears regarding the alienation of youth. These concerns did not necessarily imply a recognition of the social function of the arts, but in a significant number of interviews mention was made of the importance of the cultural environment, especially when relocating top executives to an area. Although there might be some marketing value in using the arts to build a corporate identity, it was generally felt that if Rothmans or Imperial Tobacco were less restricted in other forms of advertising they might not be so enthusiastic about their latest ventures.

At a conference held recently by the Conference Board on Effectiveness and Innovation in Corporate Giving, the general theme was that corporations must become more concerned about how their grants are being used and how they affect their immediate environment. Corporations are moving away from the bricks and mortar concept of corporate giving and towards the idea of enrichment of human lives. This would appear to have significant implications for the arts, and innovative and socially oriented arts organizations should be able to benefit from this trend. However, corporate executives were usually somewhat unaware of the social role of the arts. Other than this, the corporate bias towards professional organizations occurs because it is easier for them to evaluate large-scale national groups than it is to get involved with supporting smaller organizations and individuals.

GENERAL CORPORATE ATTITUDES

In the past, corporate support for the performing arts has been hampered by the lack of policies within this area and the typical business attitude that there should

be a dollar return associated with every expenditure. Although corporate directors can justify the purchase of art works on the basis of a "good investment", they cannot apply the same logic to supporting the performing arts. Only occasionally was the point of view expressed that corporations should battle government bureaucracy by donating the money directly to the performing arts, or that it was even necessary to maintain a plurality of support. The "sissy" image of the arts is still a detriment, and one fundraising executive described how difficult it was to raise funds for the arts in comparison with other charities. Another fund-raiser pointed out that a few large foreign-controlled companies were holding out in their support of Canadian charities and that the main burden fell upon the two hundred largest Canadian corporations.

The involvement of executives on the boards of performing arts organizations varied considerably, but a few thought the administration of performing arts organizations could be greatly improved and that The Canada Council should place priority on solving this problem. One company matched their executives' contributions and expected definite results from their participation as board members, while others preferred their executives not to waste their valuable time. One person stated that professional fund-raisers were not nearly as useful as getting the "right" rich egomaniac to run a fund drive since "everything is up for grabs and the strongest man wins". This attitude reflects the wide gap between the management style of most arts organizations and the approach of a great many business executives. Therefore, this should be given a great deal of consideration by arts organizations that want to gain support from this sector.

FUTURE SUPPORT FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

There has been a decline in the demands from the traditional charities of education, health and welfare because of increased government involvement in these areas. Consequently, the timing is ideal for the arts to pursue a greater portion of the total corporate philanthropy. It was generally felt that an united arts appeal or a system of matching grants would eliminate the difficult task of evaluating applications and encourage greater corporate donations to small arts organizations. Some companies stated the need for an advisory group to provide impartial recommendation as well as the need for a lucid document on why corporations should support the arts.

At present, there is no counterpart in Canada to the United States' Business Committee for the Arts. This Committee was formed with five objectives: (1) to obtain information on support of the arts for the business community; (2) to counsel corporations interested in aiding the arts; (3) to inform corporations of new interests for support of the arts; (4) to assist artistic organizations in presentations to corporations and to encourage participation by businessmen in arts groups; and (5) to represent business and corporate endeavours in arts organizations to government agencies.

Our interviews revealed that corporations are interested in establishing an organization similar to the Business Committee for the Arts, and several executives are already involved in promoting this development. Rothmans of Pall Mall has joined BCA, and recently won the Esquire award for their innovative work in designing and providing brochures for Canadian performing arts organizations. One executive estimated that cultural support could easily double within the next few years if coordination from the right executive team was provided. It would seem that all that is required is a certain amount of leadership, and this could conceivably come from either the arts, the corporations, the government, or some impartial body.

FOUNDATIONS

Even an educated guess on the extent of foundation wealth is exceedingly difficult, quite apart from knowing "who's who" in the world of Canadian foundations.

WHERE THE MONEY IS (1)

Most Canadian foundations tend to shun publicity and no in-depth study of activities, assets and disbursements has been published. Although there are probably some fourteen hundred foundations in Canada, fewer than nine publish reports on a regular basis and only four of these provide financial details.

When a foundation applies to the federal government for letters patent, the Canada Gazette publishes its name, the city and province where its main office will be located, and the names of its incorporators. However, at no time does it publish a comprehensive list of the names and addresses of existing Canadian foundations. This approach is in sharp contrast to practices in the United States and Britain. In 1960, the British parliament approved an act which established a public and universal central register of charities. This was largely the result of the "Nathan Report", which argued that "a charitable trust, after all, is a trust for the benefit of the public and, as such, enjoys very considerable advantages in being exempt from the rule against perpetuities and in being exempt from income tax". The report pointed out it was essential to know exactly what trusts existed if communities were to gain full benefit from them.

⁽¹⁾ Arlett, Alan. "Where the Money Is," Financial Post, May 8, 1971.

Each year, United States foundations must fill out Form 990-A, which includes the current name and address of the foundation, details of its assets and expenditures, the amount of every grant awarded together with the recipient's name and address, and a schedule of officers, directors and trustees.

In view of the developments in Britain and the United States, it seems inevitable that, unless more Canadian foundations are prepared to acknowledge a responsibility to account to the public for their activities, at some point in time government legislation must be passed to require them to do so. Foundations claim that their reason for not disclosing their activities is that they do not want to be inundated by a barrage of requests. However, the Canadian Income Tax Act contains a number of loopholes, and foundations are sometimes used for the purpose of estate planning and to retain control over family wealth.

COMMUNITY FOUNDATIONS

One of the first community foundations established in Canada was the Winnipeg Foundation, created in 1921. Its 1971 annual report estimated the market value of its total capital assets at \$10,644,000 and total grants to date were quoted as \$7,540,000. The total of new gifts for 1971 amounted to \$495,000, of which the performing arts received \$17,500 or 3.5% of the total.

The Winnipeg Foundation has been greatly exceeded in terms of total assets by the Vancouver Foundation, a similar community fund established in 1943. The 1971 annual report shows capital funds in excess of \$32 million and a distribution of funds since inception of over \$10 million. Of the \$2.5 million distributed

in 1971, just over \$100,000 or about 4% was donated to performing arts organizations.

Community foundations also exist in Ottawa, Hamilton, Calgary, Victoria, Windsor, London, Saskatoon and Metropolitan Toronto.

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS

Some of the private foundations which publish reports and fund the performing arts include the Atkinson Foundation, J.P. Bickell Foundation, Laidlaw Foundation and the Leon and Thea Koerner Foundation. Although the Floyd S. Chalmers Foundation, chartered in 1963, does not publish annual reports and has limited resources, it is extremely important to the performing arts in that it funds only arts organizations. Consequently, its level of support would match that of larger foundations which have more varied interests.

Most foundations are concentrated in the east, and public trustees estimate that some four hundred and fifty exist in Ontario alone. Since performing arts organizations in other parts of Canada do not have access to many of these foundations, this concentration helps to reinforce geographic cultural disparities.

SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS

It has been estimated by a leading fund-raising firm in Canada that for the year 1969 approximately \$550,000,000 was distributed by the various Canadian foundations. This is many times the level of corporate philanthropy and it is somewhat surprising that a greater percentage of support for the performing arts is not achieved from this source.

Of the foundations, interviewed, only the Vancouver Foundation had a committee of private citizens to process applications. Although administrative secretaries are sometimes used to process applications and evaluate requests, most grants are approved on a personal basis by the trustees, and it is to the benefit of an arts organization to have the right people on its own board.

Since most foundations interviewed had never been extensively involved in funding the arts, they did not have any objectives of support or concrete criteria for evaluating requests. It was usually stated that each application was "judged on its own merit", while "the greatest need" was cited most frequently as the most important criterion for support. Most foundations directed their money to a multiplicity of concerns in the areas of health, social services and education. Usually, applications from arts organizations were considered in conjunction with all other charitable causes and consequently they held a low priority. It was apparent that most of the people interviewed had the stereotyped image of the performing arts as an elegant social event for people who could well afford to pay, and understandably this image has prevented many of them from thinking of the arts in broader terms.

Many private foundations cannot support the arts because of restrictions in the terms of the original trusts. Even when there are no legal restraints, trustees are often relatives or close friends of the donor and do not wish to direct funds to activities that were not of interest to him. Community foundations seemed to have more freedom to allocate their funds according to current demands.

Since many foundations favour project-oriented or capital requests, small and more innovative arts organizations should have some prospect of successfully competing for these funds. However, foundations tended to favour very safe and more traditional projects.

Foundations were generally unaware of each other's activities in funding the performing arts, although a few administrators in Toronto discuss mutual problems and requests. As a group, foundations did not seem to perceive recent changes in our society to the extent that corporate executives did. However, this might result from the fact that corporations are in the market place and must observe trends very closely whereas foundations do not have the same demands.

It was difficult to determine whether foundations would change their attitude towards the arts within the next few years. It was frequently expressed that foundations like to "run their own show", and any attempt to change their attitudes would probably come up against a very strong defence. On the other hand, a few people mentioned that the current decline in requests from health, education and welfare means that foundations will have more discretionary funds at their disposal.

Unlike corporations, foundations had very little interest in an united arts appeal or matching grants since they want a clear idea of how their money is used. It appears the only major way to penetrate this source of funds is to know what foundations exist, whether they favour project or operating grants, who their trustees are, and what kind of performing arts projects they have funded in the past. A publication planned by Alan Arlett of Clarkson College in New York may be of great service in this regard.

AN INTERNATIONAL MODEL

In order to make an objective examination, it is necessary to first define a model situation with which we can compare reality. It is not necessary for the reader to agree with our model situation as long as he can identify any biases inherent in our analysis. However, in order to define our model in the most objective manner, we have turned to recent Canadian and international developments in cultural policy. (1)

INTERNATIONAL OBJECTIVE FOR SUPPORT

The first requirement in establishing a model is to define objectives in supporting the performing arts.

Although priorities change from one social, economic and political situation to another, the cultural objectives of many different countries share striking similarities. For example, in the United States "wider appreciation and enjoyment of the arts" is top priority, whereas it takes second place in Japan, which stresses "improvement of cultural quality". Tunisia also places top priority on "increased access", but couples it with a stipulation pertaining to the "cultural heritage of the nation". In Sweden, top priority is given to "support to practitioners of the arts".

The stated objectives can be classified into two categories: (1) social-cultural and (2) aesthetic-cultural. Given this distinction, we can present a set of objectives for the financial support of the performing arts.

Jain, Vijay. Formulation and Implementation of Cultural Policy: A Comparative Approach. Programme in Arts Administration.

ANALYSIS OF FUNDING PATTERNS



Social-Cultural Objectives

- . Democratization of culture
- . Encouragement of human interaction
- . Preservation of traditional cultural expressions in balance with contemporary cultural expressions
- . Promotion of an indigenous culture

Aesthetic-Cultural Objectives

- Encouragement of innovation and creativity in cultural expression
- . Encouragement of excellence in cultural pursuits
- . Deepening of cultural experiences

We must emphasize that these objectives are not stated in any order of importance. Although these objectives are interdependent, we can explain their significance separately.

DEMOCRATIZATION OF CULTURE

In our use of the term "democratization of culture", we simply mean that opportunities be provided for all people to participate in the cultural process, either in creation or in appreciation. Therefore, the term refers to the accessibility of cultural activities, not to their form. It does not mean the diffusion of only traditional art forms, but rather suggests the idea that everyone should have the opportunity to enjoy and appreciate cultural expressions. In Canada, for example, democratization might mean that all ethnic groups would be provided with the opportunity to foster their own cultures.

This concept of democratization means that government should endeavour to increase the quality of life for all citizens and to encourage all individuals to develop aesthetic values.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF HUMAN INTERACTION

Whereas democratization means creating opportunities for all people, individually, to enjoy the products and processes of cultural expression, the notion of cultural interaction refers to collective cultural expression by groups of people.

Technology, the mass media and modern modes of transportation have brought the world into closer physical proximity, but in a rapidly changing and mobile society the possibilities of forming genuine interpersonal relationships are greatly reduced. However, it is possible to recreate our sense of community through the process of group cultural expression in which the arts serve as a non-threatening medium of communication.

PRESERVATION OF TRADITIONAL CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS IN BALANCE WITH CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS

The third social-cultural objective deals with the relationship between traditional and contemporary modes of expression. Both traditional and contemporary cultural expressions increase our sense of identity and contribute to national unity. However, emerging nations which lack contemporary expression must rely on their traditions for stability, and hence Tunisia placed a top priority on "facilitating access to the cultural heritage of the nation".

In Canada, we must beware of concentrating heavily on the past because many of our traditional expressions have been imported from other countries. Furthermore, we live in an age where the present is of major importance, especially to the younger generation. However, since tradition serves to deepen our understanding of human social phenomena, it can provide depth to our creativity and make our contemporary culture richer and more meaningful.

PROMOTION OF AN INDIGENOUS CULTURE

An indigenous culture is the democratic collective expression of cultural patterns which can vary widely from region to region. Whereas in Scandinavia it would be extremely homogeneous, in Canada it must be heterogeneous in nature because of our many different heritages.

In an age when mass media knows no national boundaries and mobility is very high, there is an intensification of our national identity crisis. A nation without an indigenous culture can lose its national unity, fall prey to foreign domination and lose the opportunity for unique cultural expression. Although at some point man might identify with the entire globe, there seems to be a need for moving in a series of steps from the local level onward. Once a nation has a strong self-identity and is confident of its own cultural expression, then it can begin to share with other countries, trusting there will be mutual respect.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY IN CULTURAL EXPRESSION

The first of the objectives relating to aesthetics is the encouragement of innovation and creativity. The potential for creativity exists in every one of us, and by encouraging this potential we can hope that persons will be better able to understand themselves and their part in society. Innovation and creativity are highly dependent upon our physical environment, our exposure to cultural processes, our system of education and the freedom to express ourselves. Artists should not have to depend upon the immediate saleability of their work in order to keep alive.

Development of creativity in every person is an encompassing and complex task and, although the U.S.S.R.

is systematically planning to bring about the total development of man, most countries have shied away from such a goal and concentrate on supporting their highly creative people.

The problem in Canadian society is that we have been used to emphasizing measurable returns and efficiency. This has resulted in scientists being given numerous opportunities to experiment and contribute to technological development, but the explorations of our artists are discouraged. However, the creative process in artists has a synergystic effect and Sweden considers the support of individuals both during and after training to be the prime objective of its cultural policy.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF EXCELLENCE IN CULTURAL PURSUITS AND DEEPENING OF CULTURAL EXPERIENCES

There is presently a stigma attached to the word "excellence" because it is often associated with rigid and narrow standards of measurement. In a society where the emphasis is on free expression of equals, excellence has a connotation of being elite and contrary to democratization.

However, achievement of excellence provides not only self-fulfillment to the creator but also imparts depth and meaning to artistic appreciation. This deeper experience can aid in the process of democratization by releasing a reservoir of creative energy within our new culture consumers.

CHARACTERISTICS OF A MODEL FOR CANADA

The social and aesthetic objectives outlined above constitute a basic set of international cultural goals, but each country would have its own set of priorities. In addition, according to different social, technological, political and economic environments, there would be different strategies employed to reach these goals and different administrative procedures for monitoring and controlling the process.

A full description of an appropriate system for the support of Canadian performing arts goes far beyond the scope of this study, but it is possible to determine its major features. If we can assume that each level of government and the private sector agrees on the cultural objectives listed in the foregoing section, then we can determine their scope of involvement. However, we cannot assign different objectives to different agencies because the cultural objectives are too closely related. Furthermore, the culture of a country starts with the individual and moves to the local, regional and national level in an endless progression. If at any level we do not meet our cultural objectives, then the chain is broken and continuity of development is lost.

Obviously, the federal government should be concerned with our most excellent cultural expressions since it bears the responsibility for creating our international image. However, unless each level of funding contributes to the elevation of standards, we will not develop according to Canada's full potential. Similarly, the private individual has the greatest degree of freedom to encourage innovation but, unless the federal government is also concerned with contemporary expression, this activity will occur in uncoordinated isolation.

Since the roles which each funding agency should assume in developing our "cultural continuum" are fairly

obvious, it might be better to describe the desired effect of these efforts so that we will have a reference point for the analysis which follows.

The characteristics of a healthy culture follow directly from our list of social and aesthetic objectives and can be summarized with equal priority as follows: quality, creativity, diversity, cultural uniqueness, participation, communication, balance. (1)

It is with these characteristics in mind that we examine the Canadian performing arts and where there is neglect or over-emphasis on any of these factors we will attempt to relate them to a particular funding pattern or trend. This does not suggest that all our problems are financial, but only that the funding patterns do exert a strong influence on the development of our performing arts.

DATA BASE

When considering the analysis which follows the reader should recognize that only operating grants to performing arts organizations were compiled in our tabulations. We did not compile any capital grants, programmed activity or any grants which were for a combination of activity in the exhibiting and performing arts. Assistance that went to the arts

Schafer, D. Paul. The Foundations of Cultural

Development and Policy: A Challenge for Canada.

Programme in Arts Administration.

through the media, The Centennial Commission and the Department of External Affairs was disregarded because of the distortions or discontinuities that would be introduced.

The grants included and excluded at the provincial and municipal levels have been mentioned in the section describing the funding agencies. The only additional discrepancies were grants that were too small to be listed in public accounts, or that were not identified according to art form, such as the Newfoundland Youth and Education Department's "Encouragement of Cultural Activities". The municipalities included in our compilations are listed in Appendix A, and it is estimated that their support would represent about 95% of all cultural grants made by municipalities in Canada. Since these slight deficiencies are not large in comparison with other aggregate figures, they affect only the geographical analysis to any degree.

One of the problems faced in compiling the grants made by various organizations was how to reconcile the different fiscal years of the funding agencies. In order to arrive at some consistency, we chose The Canada Council's March 31 cut-off and adjusted other organizations accordingly. For example, municipalities usually have a December 31 fiscal year, so 1970 for a municipality was considered to be fiscal year 1970-1971, etc. We were not concerned with the fiscal year of the receiving organization or when the funds were used, except in the case of The Canada Council's listings for 1961-1962. Here, in order to avoid a discontinuity, we found it necessary to include the grants listed for Stratford, the Canadian Opera, the Vancouver and Nova Scotia Festivals in the 1960-1961 report since the funds were used during the following year.

Finally, it should be noted that our compilations on the Local Initiatives Programme include grants given for renovating facilities. Since only 17% of these grants could be used for capital purchases, they were treated as operating grants. All of the extra funds spent when projects were extended beyond the original April 31 deadline are not included.

ANALYSIS BY ART FORM

In categorizing the grants to performing arts organizations, it was necessary initially to consider only those grants which fell squarely into either opera, music, dance or theatre (festivals). The Canada Council's procedures were used as a guide in this analysis and resulted in the compilations shown in Tables I (A - E) of Appendix B. The compilations have only been made for The Canada Council, provincial agencies and municipalities. The National Arts Centre's appropriation and the Secretary of State's grants are not included because they are of general support to the performing arts. Similarly, there was not enough information on corporate, foundation and private individual support to allow us to make a breakdown.

The information in Tables I (A - E) is summarized in Table II and the percentage received by each art form is shown as a percentage of total to the nearest 1%. This information is shown graphically in Figure I of Appendix C and it is easy to see how relatively steady the breakdown has been over the years, with theatre averaging about 43%, music 35%, dance 15% and opera 7% of total grants across Canada.

The National Arts Centre appropriations and government grants of general support to the performing arts are not included above, but are added back into the summary shown in Table III. Included in the general classification are organizations like Coordinated Arts Services, the Canadian Folk Arts Council and the Canadian Conference of the Arts.

The Secretary of State's support of the Canadian Theatre Centre could have been categorized and included in Tables I and II, but it was left temporarily undesignated

in order to clarify the relationship between The Canada Council, provincial and municipal support.

It is interesting to compare relative support patterns of traditional funding agencies with the pattern of LIP and OFY support. Table IV gives the details of this breakdown, which is summarized below for fiscal year 1970-1971.

Relative Support Patterns

	Canada Council	Provincial	Municipal	Composite Traditional	<u>0 F Y</u>	LIP
% Opera	8	3	4	6	3	2
% Music	31	39	35	35	19	19
% Dance	17	12	10	14	5	4
% Theatre	44	46	51	45	73	75
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

One can see that although the traditional funding agencies do not differ radically from the composite traditional pattern, there are marked differences in the LIP and OFY breakdown. Furthermore, a check of twelve corporations and eight foundations indicates that they also fit into the traditional composite pattern.

Since The Canada Council, provincial and municipal relative support patterns only differ by a few percentage points, one can easily conclude that the traditional pattern has been established by The Canada Council and that other agencies are following suit either consciously or because organizations supported by The Canada Council have greater credibility.

Since OFY and LIP patterns are nearly identical to each other but differ radically from the traditional pattern, one might conclude that the groups funded were not affected by The Canada Council or any other funding agency's practices. In fact, the criteria for assessing LIP and OFY applications were based more upon the social benefit and employment opportunities created.

Although the extreme bias towards theatre might be explained partially with arguments about it requiring less physical training, planning, facilities, etc., one must still conclude that the new pattern is a true reflection of public interest. This conclusion is supported by the fact that professional theatre audiences have also been increasing relatively faster than in the other performing arts.

In summary, we must conclude that the traditional pattern is consistent with aesthetic-cultural goals, but is not consistent with social-cultural goals. Moreover, our analysis raises some interesting questions about past attempts at democratization where the social and aesthetic objectives have been combined. In the future, perhaps more emphasis should be placed on the public's interest. For example, our research indicates that the physical location of traditional performances poses extreme psychological barriers to the ordinary person, but open-air performances are both well attended and well received. Similarly, ticket pricing, content and amateur activity are significant factors in the social aspects of our culture.

PROFESSIONAL/NON-PROFESSIONAL DIMENSION

The grants to performing arts organizations from the federal, provincial and municipal governments were categorized not only by art form but also along the "professional/non-professional" dimension. Since it is difficult to establish definite criteria on what constitutes professionalism, it was necessary to designate certain organizations arbitrarily as "professional", and these are listed in Appendix B. This is basically the same group that The Canada Council has been subsidizing over the past few years, and "professional" should be construed to mean nothing more than this group of organizations. All other organizations are designated as "non-professional". The "professionals" are not necessarily the largest organizations since Jeunesses Musicales, for example, is much larger than "professional" organizations like the McGill Chamber Music Orchestra or the Saskatoon Symphony.

The relative percentage of support (to the nearest 1%) received by "professionals" within each art form and at each level of support is shown in Tables I (A - D), and the composite picture is outlined in Table I (E). The composite information is shown graphically in Figure II for each level of funding and one can easily see the strong trend for "professionals" to receive relatively more and more support.

This trend is firmly established by The Canada Council, which moved from allocating 62% of its funds to the "professional" group in 1961-1962 to 81% in 1970-1971. This trend seems to have levelled off in recent years, but it reflects The Canada Council's policy to "raise rather than spread".

The provincial trend during the same time was to move from 43% to 57% for "professional" groups, with most

of the increase occurring from 1961-1962 to 1965-1966. In the past five years, there has actually been a slight reversal in the tendency, which correlates well with the liberal attitude towards amateur activity that we found in many of our interviews.

The most surprising result of our analysis is the strong trend in municipal support favouring the "professional". In 1961-1962, the relative support for professionals was only 52%, but it has since increased to 82%. Although our interviews suggested this direction, it destroys a historic assumption of The Canada Council that amateur activity should receive support at the local level. As indicated during our interviews, this assumption is incorrect, because local politics are volatile, funds are scarce, knowledge of the arts is limited, and only the most prestigious organizations can demand municipal support.

There was insufficient information to do a complete analysis of this tendency in the private sector, but a spot-check of the twelve corporations and eight foundations over the past ten years indicated that the trend was not as pronounced, but the bias was the same. The "professional" giving received a fairly constant 65% - 70% of total foundation support and 85% - 90% of corporate support.

It should be emphasized that our analysis actually underestimates the trends because our definition of "professional" groups was constant and we did not add to it any semi-professional groups that achieved maturity during this time period. It should also be recognized that the analysis underestimates the tendency for agencies to increasingly favour the largest organizations since our original professional group excludes Jeunesses Musicales, the Dominion Drama Festival and other major groups.

Tables I (A -D) indicate the relative emphasis on the "professional" group for each art form and the information is shown graphically in Figure III. It

would appear that bias towards "professionalism" is increasing only in theatre, and is decreasing in opera and dance. However, one should realize that the recent change in opera was caused by the collapse of the Theatre Lyrique of Quebec, and our "professional" group excludes La Regie de la Place des Arts. Similarly, the decline in emphasis on "professional" dance is due mainly to the National Ballet School being considered outside this group. For the four art forms combined, support for the "professional" organizations has moved from 55% in 1961-1962 to 72% in 1970-1971.

By examining Table IV, one can draw a comparison between this traditional pattern and the LIP and OFY programmes. The OFY programme by its definition could not be expected to include anyone but youth groups. On the other hand, two "professional" organizations, the Neptune Theatre and the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, took advantage of LIP and together received 2% of the total performing arts support.

The "professional" bias in The Canada Council's funding could be corrected in the following manner: (1) our largest performing arts organizations which have achieved international stature could be recognized as national arts assets and funded entirely by the federal government, either by special grants through The Canada Council or directly by the Secretary of State; (2) support for the remaining large "professional" groups should be levelled off at a point consistent with their potential scope of operation since it is illogical for every organization to develop international standards.

The resulting extra financial flexibility would allow The Canada Council to return to its original role of raising standards, to begin to eliminate cultural disparities, to support experimental and innovative projects, to increase its support for individual artists, and to give stability to groups emerging from LIP and OFY.

GEOGRAPHIC CULTURAL DISPARITIES

In categorizing arts organizations by geography, we were faced with the problem of establishing, for example, whether the Canadian Opera Company has a national influence or whether its influence is mainly in Ontario. Our decisions are somewhat arbitrary, but have been based upon the scope of each organization's activities.

The Canadian Opera Company is included as an Ontario organization in our analysis since touring is only about one-quarter of its total budget. The National Ballet's touring is nearly one-half its total budget, but a lot of this is done within Ontario. The National Ballet School's influence was considered to be within Ontario because Les Grand Ballets Canadiens and the Royal Winnipeg Ballet both operate their own schools. Similarly, the National Arts Centre was considered to exert its influence mainly in Ontario, whereas Jeunesses Musicales, the Canadian Music Centre, Canadian Theatre Centre, National Youth Orchestra and Dominion Drama Festival were all organizations which were considered to have a national scope.

The details of our analysis are shown in Tables V (A - K), and are summarized regionally in Table VI by excluding the "National or Undefined Grants". Although the Atlantic Symphony grants could not be allocated in Table V to any one province, Table VI includes them in the Atlantic region. This regional breakdown is shown graphically in Figure IV, and by comparing the percentage of support with the percentage of population (to the nearest 1%) one can quickly determine where geographic disparities exist. For example, Ontario has about 35% of Canada's population but receives about 49% of the total funds.

Table VII compares (to the nearest .5% for ease of comparison) the geographic breakdown of performing arts

organizations funded in the traditional manner with those funded under LIP and OFY. The fact that there were significant differences in the relative breakdown indicates that the traditional pattern is not necessarily consistent with the demand or potential within any province.

For example, there was a marked improvement in the situation of British Columbia, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia under the new programmes, while Ontario's relative position was more in keeping with its population. Provinces still relatively disadvantaged were Alberta and Newfoundland, but generally the new patterns conformed more closely with the provinces' populations.

RELATIVE SUPPORT PATTERNS

To assess how the various public funding agencies contribute to developing performing arts organizations, one can consult Table III or the graphic illustration of Figure V. In the past few years, The Canada Council has maintained about 40% of the relative support, down from 52% in 1961-1962, whereas the provinces have recently maintained about 32% of support for performing arts organizations, up from about 25% ten years earlier. Municipal support declined steadily from 24% in 1961-1962 to 10% in 1967-1968, but has remained constant since. The Canada Council and municipal support was offset mainly by the Secretary of State and the National Arts Centre, whose combined support went from 0% in

1963-1964 to 18% in 1970-1971. One can conclude that The Canada Council, provincial and municipal levels have nearly equal rates of growth in their support of the performing arts since for the past few years they have assumed fairly constant relative levels of support.

PROVINCIAL PATTERNS

Although in aggregate the relative pattern of support has been relatively constant, the fluctuation within each province has been considerable. By consulting Tables V (A-J), one finds that the major variations have occurred in the federal-provincial split.

For example, the emergence of the British Columbia Centennial Cultural Fund has increased the relative provincial support from 19% in 1966-1967 to 43% in 1970-1971. This suggests that The Canada Council could stimulate the development of the performing arts a tremendous amount by providing the leadership or incentives necessary to create official provincial agencies in the Maritimes.

Although Alberta, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia are culturally disparate provinces, The Canada Council's relative position in each is approximately the 40% national average. Since their support is not lacking and it is necessary for each agency to provide greater assistance, The Canada Council should open up communications and establish formula grant arrangements before attempting to eliminate these cultural disparities.

New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are also culturally disparate, but here The Canada Council's relative support has been much less than usual. The situation could be improved by The Canada Council supporting more activity in these provinces, but again the formula grant arrangement would seem useful in stimulating more provincial and municipal giving.

In the culturally advantaged provinces of Manitoba and Ontario, a formula grant based on a 50/30/20 split between federal/provincial/municipal support would work to the advantage of the federal government since it presently provides 62% of the support in each. On the other hand, it would be expensive for the federal government to readjust the present 41/49/10 split in Quebec.

MUNICIPAL PATTERNS

Despite all flunctuations in the relative roles of federal and provincial governments, the municipal level has been a fairly constant 10% to 15%. Exceptions to this rule occur in P.E.I. and Newfoundland where municipal support is very low and in Alberta where it is high.

Although in aggregate the relative support by municipalities seems fairly stable, our interviews indicated there was great instability at this level of funding. Therefore, the need for greater communication and a formula grant arrangement is even more urgent than at the provincial level and a first step towards achieving this liaison might be to work through the Canadian Federation of Mayors.

In Sweden, municipalities supply over half the current \$13.20 per capita support for the arts (1), while in Canada municipalities supply about 10% of approximately \$.80 per capita support for the performing arts. Therefore, despite the differences in governmental structures, it would seem necessary to lobby with the provinces to remove constraints on municipal grants and to stimulate this source as much as possible.

⁽¹⁾ The State and Culture in Sweden. Swedish Institute, 1970, p. 60.

ANALYSIS OF PRIVATE FUNDING

In order to build up an approximation of private support, it was necessary to first consult The Canada Council's records on the "professional" performing arts organizations and determine their total private fund-raising efforts. The next step was to analyse our sample of twelve corporations and eight foundations and determine that approximately 80% of their grants went to this same group. Having thereby determined the magnitude of private grants to "non-professionals", a total figure was established and included in Table VIII, which summarizes both public and private support. These figures are shown graphically in Figure VI illustrating how private support has dwindled from a peak of approximately 34% in 1963-1964 to its 1970-1971 level of 15%.

CORPORATIONS

To extend our analysis further, an approximation to total corporate support was determined using Taxation Statistics, Department of National Revenue, and Corporate Financial Statistics, Statistics Canada. It was then determined from our sample of twelve corporations that approximately 75% of their cultural operating grants were for the performing arts, and it became possible to scale down the Conference Board figures on cultural operating grants and determine the percentage of corporate philanthropy going to the performing arts. Next, by multiplying total corporate donations by the percentage granted the performing arts organizations, we arrived at a very rough approximation of total corporate support for the performing arts.

Finally, to determine the relative trends in corporate support for the arts, we expressed the above figures as a percentage of the total private support and as a percentage of total private and public support.

The above calculations are outlined in Table IX and the trends are expressed graphically in Figure VII. Similar to the general trend in private philanthropy shown in Figure VI, corporate support as a percentage of all performing arts support has declined from 18% in 1961-1962 to 8% in 1970-1971. However, the rate of giving to the arts is slowly increasing and corporations have consistently donated between 40% and 50% of all private support.

FOUNDATIONS

Based on the experience of fund-raisers, it is unlikely that foundations provide more than about 20% of private support for the performing arts. Since their total philanthropy is nearly eight times total corporate donations, one can estimate that the performing arts only receive about .15% of their annual disbursements.

Our analysis of eight foundations indicated that although they were slightly more democratic than corporations in their funding patterns, there was still a very high bias of 65% to 70% towards the organizations classified as "professional" in this report. This would reflect the conservative outlook of the foundations and their unwillingness to venture into new and uncharted waters, but it might also indicate the difficulty that smaller organizations have in approaching them for support.

It was concluded from our interviews that foundations usually favour capital or project-oriented appeals and that there is a great potential for small arts organizations to gain their support. However, the organizations must

be willing to put the right people on their board of directors, and this would be dangerous for innovative contemporary groups. For example, the director of one foundation stated that he sits on the boards of the arts organizations assisted because "money talks", and admitted that his presence has a definite conservative effect.

PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

As mentioned earlier, there has been a significant decline in the amount of corporate donations as a percentage of profit over the past ten years. This trend has been even more pronounced regarding individual charitable donations, and <u>Taxation Statistics</u> of the Department of National Revenue shows that individual giving has dropped from an average of 3.4% of taxable income in 1960 to .79% in 1970.

Many of the same people who are involved in funding the performing arts through corporations and foundations are also individual contributors. It would appear that this financial elite regularly sit on the boards of non-profit organizations because of the financial aid they can provide directly or through their many contacts. As a general rule, fund drives should be able to get 20% of the total public goal from people who are doing the fund raising. Since corporations assume approximately 50% of total private donations and board members about 20%, about 30% of any fund drive would be achieved through solicitation of foundations, subscribers, and other private individuals.

One of the most recent innovations in private giving has been instituted by Coordinated Arts Services in its Lotterio scheme. In the 1971 campaign, approximately \$345,000 was raised and distributed among ten participating performing arts organizations in proportion to the tickets sold by their volunteer organizations. Seven

of the participating organizations were deemed to be of "professional" nature for the purposes of this report and received approximately 85% of these monies.

Lotterio was a particularly appealing scheme for the larger organizations since it opened up a new source of revenue. If they had joined an united arts appeal that approached the usual sources of private support their identity would have been blurred and they might have lost ground.

.

This analysis of private funding verifies many of the conclusions reached in our interviews, and it would seem imperative that The Canada Council act to stimulate private giving before it becomes negligible in comparison with other funding agencies.

As mentioned earlier, this could partially be done by promoting the formation of a Canadian counterpart to the BCA, with recommendations that there be an equal board representation from the arts community and that this include representation from smaller organizations.

However, if our larger organizations were declared national arts assets and funded independently, the formation of a national arts appeal would be feasible and seems to be a better approach than forming a Canadian BCA because: (1) the appeal can stimulate private support in general, rather than concerning itself only with corporations; (2) it would lend credibility to the smaller arts organizations and would have less tendency to favour the large established performing arts companies; (3) the appeal reduces the necessity for arts organizations to have rich and powerful people sit on their boards and thereby decreases the potential for conflict. Since BCA acts mainly to open up communication channels, if anything it would increase this problem; (4) the regional or local organization of the national arts appeal could act as an advisory to municipalities, help plan cultural facilities, provide administrative

assistance to new arts organizations, provide liaison with The Canada Council and generally improve the flow of information; (5) the national appeal could help overcome the regional bias in private support and distribute the funds more evenly across Canada; (6) finally, The Canada Council could provide matching grants to aid in stimulating private support and, if the appeal were to be organized by its field officers, this would effectively decentralize The Canada Council's operations.

Although this is a radical departure from The Canada Council's usual approach, its leadership and resources are necessary if the performing arts are to maintain their plurality of support.

PROJECTION OF TRENDS

For the greatest portion of this analysis we have looked at relative support patterns rather than absolute amounts because it is difficult to logically determine the optimum absolute level of support for each art form, each size of organization, each funding agency, each province, etc. However, in order to realistically plan, one must begin to look at absolute dollar trends, and Figure VIII plots the past ten years and projects up to 1974-1975.

The most difficult curve to extrapolate was the Secretary of State and the National Arts Centre support where growth has been much more rapid than in other areas.

However, when the best fitting curve was used to project the support in each sector, it was possible to insert the resulting figures into Table X.

Table X adds the expected amounts of support from the Secretary of State and the National Arts Centre, the provinces, municipalities and the private sector into a sub-total. This sub-total is subtracted from the total projected requirements in order to get The Canada Council's portion. One can see that the relative percentage of support by most funding agencies is relatively constant, the major exception to this being the private sector which drops from 15% to 12%.

The absolute dollar requirement from all agencies in 1974-1975 is projected to be \$32.5 million, with The Canada Council's portion being \$11.6 million. This is a minimum projection since it does not allow for increased support to individual artists, elimination of cultural disparities, or for the development of new groups. If we assume that by 1974-1975 15% of the LIP groups have developed into year-round operations, the extra \$1.5 million would boost our projection to \$34 million. Regarding cultural disparities, if in 1970-1971 each province had a per capita expenditure equal to Ontario, the total performing arts support would have increased from \$17 million to \$22 million, and in 1974-1975 the requirement would be \$42 million.

INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS

Although the original terms of reference of this study focused on grants to private arts organizations, we feel there should be at least some mention of support for individual artists. The table below approximates the amount allocated to individual performing artists by The Canada Council, the B.C. Cultural Fund, the Alberta Cultural Development Branch, the Saskatchewan Arts Board and the Quebec Department of Cultural Affairs and compares this assistance with funds allocated to organizations.

	Total	Total	Percentage
	Individual	Organizations & Individual	Individual
1964/65	161,450	3,297,290	4.9
1965/66	490,401	5,764,700	8.5
1966/67	413,760	6,862,368	6.1
1967/68	507,500	10,763,766	4.7
1968/69	808,973	12,934,606	6.2
1969/70	993,016	16,269,952	6.1
1970/71	848,317	17,800,667	4.8

One can see that individual support has averaged about 6% of total organizational and individual support and, since history rarely notes the achievements of organizations but rather acclaims the individual artist, one can question this relative emphasis of support. Certainly, Canada's 6% is not high, since in Sweden the 1971 cultural budget indicates that stage artists and musicians alone receive 21.7 million SKr out of a total budget of 259 million SKr, or approximately 8%. (1)

⁽¹⁾ The State and Culture in Sweden. Swedish Institute, 1970, p. 52.

It is sometimes assumed that since performing artists work in groups, the monies paid to performing arts organizations are an indirect subsidy to them. However, when one considers the extremely low wages of performing artists, one questions if this is enough support. Moreover, the theory does not apply as much to playwrights and certainly less to composers, whose works are sometimes never played during their lifetime.

Again, it would be very difficult to estimate the absolute subsidy required without first researching how many Canadian artists exist and what they presently earn. If this were done, one could easily calculate the monies necessary to bring them up to an income commensurate with their skill, training, and contribution to our culture.

In Sweden, artists are provided with a guaranteed annual income and pension plans. A possible alternative could be the institution of a Canada Council depository of compositions and plays, similar to the Art Bank. Artists could then have the satisfaction of being paid for their works and know that the depository will in the future be attempting to collect royalties on their use. In order to preserve some of the artist's copyright, any excessive royalties could be directed back to the artist or his estate.

These schemes are only a few of many plans that could allow talented artists to create without unnecessary financial distraction, and it is recommended that The Canada Council pay close attention to this problem area.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Since the major conclusions and recommendations of this study were placed at the beginning, this section will only contain a few concluding remarks.

The report began by describing the funding agencies in Canada which support the performing arts, and some of the comments made when we interviewed the officials of each. To introduce the analysis section we first outlined an international model of culture so that any biases inherent in our analysis would be fully exposed.

In comparing the performing arts in Canada with this model, it becomes apparent that until recently our funding patterns were consistent mainly with aesthetic-cultural goals, and therefore the main characteristics of our performing arts are those of quality and creativity. However, with the advent of LIP and OFY, funds began to be automatically diverted towards social-cultural goals. In fact, our culture began to include the characteristics of diversity, cultural uniqueness, participation, communication and balance.

Our increased "diversity" can perhaps be illustrated by an LIP-funded group called "Multitude (Tri Solar Pool)", which has a total arts philosophy. Its members are dancers studying drawing and sculpture, but producing theatre, so it appears that diversity is increasingly characteristic of Canadian arts groups themselves as well as our culture as a whole.

Our "cultural uniqueness" has been greatly enhanced by the multitude of Canadian plays being written and produced with assistance from the new federal programmes. A good example of these indigenous groups is "Manitou Productions" of Winnipeg whose LIP project was "to produce Indian plays, with Indian actors, training set designers, ...".

Our cultural "participation and communication" has perhaps never been greater with artists and groups addressing themselves to previously neglected audiences in strange physical surroundings. For example, the audience addressed by the "Mobile Ensemble for Education Through Theatre" included senior citizens, orphans, crippled and blind people, unwed mothers, sick children and inmates of Guelph Correctional Institution.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we have begun to work towards the characteristic of "balance" in our culture. The infusion of OFY and LIP funds into the arts has caused a discontinuity in a traditional funding pattern that over time has favoured certain organizations and locales to a greater and greater degree. It remains up to The Canada Council to formulate a performing arts policy in cooperation with other funding agencies. It is hoped that such a policy will be based on the concept of balance so that unhealthy patterns of support may be avoided in the future.



APPENDIX A



INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS: PROVINCIAL

British Columbia

Honourable W.H. Murray, Chairman British Columbia Centennial Cultural Fund

Honourable Lawrie J. Wallace Provincial Under Secretary

Alberta

Mr. Walter Kaasa, Director Cultural Development Branch

Honourable Horst A. Schmid, Minister Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation

Saskatchewan

Mr. Verne Bell, Acting Executive Director Saskatchewan Arts Board

Honourable Ed Tchorzowski, Minister Department of Culture and Youth

Manitoba

Miss Mary Elizabeth Bayer, Executive Director Manitoba Arts Council

Mr. Hugh Benham, Chairman Manitoba Arts Council

Ontario

Mr. Louis Applebaum, Executive Director Ontario Arts Council

Honourable George Kerr, Minister Department of University Affairs

Miss Naomi Lightbourn, Executive Secretary Ontario Arts Council

Mr. Peter Mortimer, Superintendent Department of Youth and Recreation

Mr. Robert Sirman, Executive Officer Department of the Provincial Secretary

Mr. D. Steinhauser, Cultural Exchange Programme Department of Education

Quebec

M. Gilbert Gagnon, Directeur de Recherche et Planification Department of Cultural Affairs

New Brunswick

Mr. Fred Arsenault, Principal Secretary to the Premier

Mr. John Williamson, Deputy Minister Department of Finance

Nova Scotia

Mr. Randall Smith, Executive Assistant to the Minister of Finance and Education

Prince Edward Island

Mr. Christopher Gledhill, Music Consultant Department of Education

Newfoundland

Mr. John C. Perlin, Director of Cultural Affairs

INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS: MUNICIPAL

British Columbia

Mr. Jonathan Baker, Director Social Planning and Community Development City of Vancouver

Mr. Lloyd E. Berry, Fine Arts Coordinator Parks and Recreation Commission City of Burnaby

Mr. Arthur Phillips, Alderman City of Vancouver

Mr. Peter Pollen, Mayor City of Victoria

Alberta

Miss Jean Bara, Grants Coordinator City of Edmonton

Dr. R. Ritter, Chairman Calgary Region Arts Foundation

Mrs. Jennifer Webber, Director of Drama Parks and Recreation Department City of Edmonton

Mr. Tom Yarmon, Executive Assistant to Mayor City of Calgary

Saskatchewan

Mr. W. Koyl, Alderman City of Saskatoon

Mr. Henry Walter, Mayor City of Regina

Manitoba

Mr. Wm. Sasaki, Alderman and Chairman of Sub-Committee on Grants City of Winnipeg

Mr. Robert Taft, Alderman and Acting Deputy Mayor City of Winnipeg

Ontario

M. Pierre Benoit, Mayor City of Ottawa

Mrs. Jane Bigelow, Mayor City of London

Mr. Albert Campbell, Chairman Metropolitan Toronto Council

Mr. Victor K. Copps, Mayor City of Hamilton

Mr. Wm. Dennison, Mayor City of Toronto

Mr. Joseph Fabbro, Mayor City of Sudbury

Mr. Karl Jaffary, Alderman City of Toronto

Mr. S.M. McLellan, Mayor City of Kitchener-Waterloo

Mr. David Rotenberg, Alderman City of Toronto

Mr. F. Wansborough, Mayor City of Windsor

Quebec

M. Ferdinand Biondi, Director Montreal Arts Council

M. Gilles Lamontagne, Mayor City of Quebec

New Brunswick

Mr. John James, Public Relations City of Saint John

Mr. Eric Kipping, Councillor City of Saint John

Mr. Bob Lockhart, Mayor City of Saint John

Mr. H.L. McFee, Deputy Mayor City of Fredericton

Mrs. N. W. MacLellan, President Saint John's Arts Council

Mr. Ron Parkes, Controller City of Saint John

Nova Scotia

Mr. Walter Fitzgerald, Mayor City of Halifax

Mr. Roland Thornhill, Mayor City of Dartmouth

Newfoundland

Mr. Rupert Greene, City Clerk City of St. John's

INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS: CORPORATE

British Columbia

Mr. Ralph Gillen, Vice-President MacMillan Bloedel, Vancouver

Alberta

Mr. A.J.E. Child, President Burns Foods Limited, Calgary

Mr. D.R. Hagerman, Vice-President and Treasurer Husky Oil Company, Calgary

Mr. Fred McKinnon, President B.P. Oil and Gas Limited, Calgary

Mr. W.T. Tye, Senior Vice-President Pacific Petroleum Limited, Calgary

Saskatchewan

Mr. R.H. Boyes, President, Consumers' Cooperative Refineries, Saskatoon

Manitoba

Mr. Sam Cohen, Vice-Chairman Metropolitan Stores Limited, Fort Garry

Ontario

Mr. J.A. Armstrong, President Imperial Oil Limited, Toronto

Mr. W.I. Barton, Secretary-Treasurer Silverwood Industries Limited, London Mr. Frank Butler, Public Relations Coordinator Shell Canada Limited, Toronto

Mr. Robert Butler, President The T. Eaton Company Limited, Toronto

Mr. H.C. Cunningham, Assistant Treasurer Canada Packers Limited, Toronto

Mr. J. Hartford, Public Relations John Labatt Limited, Toronto

Mr. Alan Hanlon, Manager of Public Relations Rothmans of Pall Mall Limited, Toronto

Mr. Robert Hawkes, President Rothmans of Pall Mall Limited, Toronto

Mr. Robert Hurlbut, President General Foods Limited, Toronto

Mr. Dawson Jamieson, Chairman of Contributions Committee J.M. Schneider Limited, Kitchener

Mr. Lee L. Keener, Secretary-Treasurer B.F. Goodrich (Canada) Limited, Kitchener

Mr. Frank McEachren, Contributions Chairman The T. Eaton Company Limited, Toronto

Mr. Robin Pitcher, Trust Officer Montreal Trust Company, Toronto

Mr. B.R. Telfer, Treasurer The Goodyear Tire Company, Kitchener

Mr. W. Terry The Conference Board, Ottawa

Mr. Thomas Van Zuidon, Treasurer Dominion Foundries and Steel, Hamilton

Mr. J.H. Yocom, Manager of Public Relations Gulf Oil Canada Limited, Toronto Mr. Robert Young, Director of Public Relations Chrysler Canada Limited, Windsor

Quebec

Mr. Roger Bourgon, Director of Public Relations Consolidated Bathurst Limited, Montreal

Mr. Paul Costello, Division Manager Dupont of Canada Limited, Montreal

Isabelle Sauberli, Executive Secretary
Du Maurier Council for the Performing Arts, Montreal

INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS: FOUNDATIONS

British Columbia

Mr. Geoffrey Andrew, Chairman of Projects Committee Leon and Thea Koerner Foundation, Vancouver

Mr. Peter Kaye, Executive Director The Vancouver Foundation

Mr. David McGann, Professional Consultant The Vancouver Foundation

Alberta

Mr. W. Meech The Riveredge Foundation, Calgary

Mr. Carl Nickle, President The Nickle Foundation, Calgary

Manitoba

Mr. Hugh Benham, Chairman The Winnipeg Foundation

Ontario

Mr. Norm Bishop, Secretary The Atkinson Foundation, Toronto

Mr. Floyd S. Chalmers Floyd S. Chalmers Foundation, Toronto

Mr. H.C. Cunningham, Secretary McLean Foundation, Toronto

Mr. H.C. Hindmarsh, President The Atkinson Foundation, Toronto

Dr. R.N. Laidlaw, Director The Laidlaw Foundation, Toronto

Mr. J.L. Main, Director Beaverbrook Foundation, New Brunswick and Senior Vice-President Montreal Trust, Toronto

Mr. Frank McEachern, Contributions Chairman The Eaton Foundation, Toronto

Mr. Robin Pitcher, Trust Officer for Beaverbrook Foundation, Montreal Trust Company, Toronto

Mr. P.J. Sewell, Secretary of J.P. Bickell Foundation, National Trust, Toronto

Mrs. Mary Claire Thomas, Secretary The Laidlaw Foundation, Toronto

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS INCLUDED IN TABULATIONS

City of Vancouver
District of West Vancouver
District of North Vancouver
District of Burnaby
City of Victoria
District of Saanich
City of Calgary
City of Edmonton
City of Regina
City of Saskatoon
Metropolitan Winnipeg
City of Winnipeg
City of Windsor
City of London
City of Kitchener

City of Hamilton

Metropolitan Toronto City of Toronto Borough or East York Borough of North York Borough of Scarborough Borough of Mississauga City of Sudbury City of Ottawa City of Montreal City of Quebec City of Fredericton City of Saint John City of Halifax City of Dartmouth City of Charlottetown City of St. John's

ORGANIZATIONS DESIGNATED AS "PROFESSIONAL" IN ANALYSIS

MUSIC

The Atlantic Symphony Orchestra, Halifax (New Brunswick and Halifax)

Calgary Philharmonic Society

Edmonton Symphony Orchestra Society

McGill Chamber Orchestra, Montreal

L'Orchestre Symphonique de Montreal

L'Orchestre Symphonique de Quebec

Regina Orchestra Society

Saskatoon Symphony Orchestra

Toronto Symphony Orchestra

Vancouver Symphony Orchestra

Victoria Symphony Orchestra

Victoria Symphony Orchestra

National Arts Centre Orchestra, Ottawa

THEATRE

Centaur Foundation for the Performing Arts, Montreal
Charlottetown Summer Festival
Citadel Theatre, Edmonton
Globe Theatre, Regina
Manitoba Theatre Centre, Winnipeg
Montreal International Theatre

Neptune Theatre Foundation, Halifax
Playhouse Theatre Foundation, Halifax
Shaw Festival, Niagara-on-the-Lake
Stratford Shakespearean Festival
Theatre Calgary
Theatre de Marjolaine, Eastman, Quebec
Theatre du Nouveau Monde, Montreal
Theatre Populaire du Quebec, Montreal
Theatre de Quat'Sou, Montreal
Theatre du Rideau Vert, Montreal
Toronto Arts Foundation (includes Crest Theatre,
Canadian Players and Theatre Toronto)
Toronto Workshop Productions

OPERA

Canadian Opera Company, Toronto Edmonton Opera Association Theatre Lyrique du Quebec, Quebec Vancouver Opera Association

DANCE

Les Feux-Follets, Montreal Les Grands Ballets Canadiens, Montreal National Ballet Guild, Toronto Royal Winnipeg Ballet

APPENDIX B



TABLE I (A)

DETAILS OF GRANTS TO PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

CATEGORIZED BY ART FORM

OPERA

1968/69 1969/70 1970/71	420,000 480,000 467,000 - 94,900	420,000 480,000 561,900	100 100 83		268,500 314,993 152,500	268,500 314,993 152,500	100 100 100		45,375 51,325 58,000 3,932 4,995 3,330	49,307 56,320 61,330	92 91 95		733,875 846,318 677,500 3,932 4,995 98,230	737,807 851,313 775,730	48 66 66
1967/68	376,167	376,167	100		201,800	201,800	100		43,875	860,847	16		621,842	626,065	66
1966/67	195,200	195,200	100		151,000	154,000	86		29,375	30,655	96		375,575	379,855	66
1965/66	130,000	130,000	100		89,890	068 06	86		28,750	29,620	46		248,640	250,540	66
1964/65	85,000	85,000	100		70,049	670,17	86		35,678	36,578	100		190,727	192,627	66
1963/64	76,500	16,500	100		79,774	92,774	98		20,000	26,040	777		176,274	195,314	06
1962/63	81,000	81,000	100		23,000	28,800	80		18,000	23,700	9/		122,000	133,500	16
1961/62	82,000	82,000	100		22,500	26,500	85		18,500	24,639	75		123,000	133,139	92
CANADA COUNCIL	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	PROVINCIAL AGENCIES	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	SEISTED AGENSIES	"IFC;ESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	"IPROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL GRANTS	"FROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TATO:	% "PROFESSIONAL"

TABLE I (B)

CATECORIZED BY ART FORM

MUSIC

						~			0.5				10		
1970/71	1,699,012	2,149,197	64		950,303	1,924,789	67		377,610 176,287	553,897	63		3,026,925	4,627,883	65
1269/70	1,558,140	1,976,738	64		936,641	1,694,795	59		412,635	. 590,655	7/		2,967,416	4,230,593	70
1968/69	1,349,700	1,749,239	44		700,804	1,392,079	50		320,043	444,403	72		2,370,547	3,585,711	99
1967/63	1,016,850	1,442,412	70		578,150 553,206	1,131,356	51		310,982	412,164	92		1,905,982	2,985,932	64
19/9961	616,240 289,056	905,296	89		412,800	824,670	50		288,013	409,753	70		1,317,053	2,139,719	. 29
1965/66	520,460 255,193	. 775,653	49		306,150	555,191	33		201,347	236,757	77		1,027,957	1,617,601	63
1964/65	260,500	369,745	17		215,873 257,903	473,776	97		209,385	290,051	72		685,758	1,133,572	19
1963/64	232,750	339,513	69		228,123	419,037	54		162,325	229,900	77		623,198	988,500	63
1962/63	245,500	372,750	99		153,500	273,325	58		173,607	238,089	73		577,607	884,162	65
1961/62	232,000	426,641	54		115,000	214,696	75		149,325 62,375	211,700	77		496,325	853,037	A. 25
CANADA COUNCIL	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	FROVINCIAL AGENCIES	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	MUNICIPAL ACENCIES	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL GRANTS	"PROTESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"

TABLE I (C)

CATECORIZED BY ART FORM

DANCE

1970/71	1,021,065	1,167,365	100		341,850 241,850	583,700	58		159,189	167,689	. 56		1,522,104	1,918,754	64
1969/70	903,777	1,021,232	89		524,367	704,967	75		149,190	151,490	66		1,577,334	1,877,689	78
1968/69	852,000 130,000	982,000	87		363,750	496,750	. 73		145,460	151,710	96		1,361,210	1,630,460	83
1967/68	705,000	803,000	6 0		320,000	427,897	75		132,000	137,250	%		1,157,000	1,368,147	50
1966/67	490,000	535,207	16		272,000	308,655	80		145,000	149,250	86		907,000	993,112	16
1965/66	393,000	420,730	93		170,000	194,700	87		110,000	113,500	1.6		673,000	728,930	92
1964/65	180,000	180,000	100		162,000	173,750	93		68,000	73,000	93		410,000	426,750	%
1963/64	166,500	179,500	93		745,780	157,630	92		58,500	63,500	92		370,780	400,630	76
1962/63	174,500	174,500	100		39,000	51,500	92		50,500	55,500	16		264,000	281,500	76
1961/62	170,000	170,000	100		34,000	72,500	72		49,000	54,000	16		253,000	271,500	93
CANADA COTINCITI,	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	PROVINCIAL AGENCIES	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	MUNICIPAL AGENCIES	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL GRANTS	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"

TABLE I (D)

CATEGORIZED BY ART FORM

THEATRE

					2 V T W 2 U T					
CANADA COUNCIL	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1965/66	19/9961	1967/68	1968/69	1969/70	1970/71
"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	162,500	168,400	211,600	261,096	747,400	773,085	1,554,500	1,733,270	1,931,960	2,409,900
TOTAL	370,625	366,380	374,920	399,066	1,025,952	1,159,831	1,960,782	2,246,583	2,488,746	2,999,310
% "PROFESSIONAL"	73	97	99	99	73	49	44	111	7/8	80
PROVINCIAL AGENCIES										
"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	50,000	94,250	171,400	264,461	566,326	472,200	680,150	740,658	873,087	1,347,578
TOTAL	228,350	300,490	470,850	581,761	950,875	912,176	1,318,590	1,400,759	1,723,783	2,250,968
% "PROFESSIONAL"	22	31	36	97	09	52	52	53	51	09
MUNICIPAL AGENCIES										
"FROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	35,000	41,500	85,000	153,500	196,497	216,713	231,500	396,519	528,039	703,796
TOTAL	187,808	154,125	197,820	266,734	342,096	358,318	374,648	530,941	632,135	808,603
% "PROFESSIONAL"	19	27	73	57	57	09	62	75	78	84
TOTAL GRANTS										
"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	247,500	304,150	468,000	679,057	1,510,223	1,461,998	2,466,150	2,870,447	3,333,086	4,461,274
TOTAL	786,783	820,995	1,043,590	1,247,561	2,318,923	2,430,325	3,654,020	4,178,283	799,478,7	6,058,880
% "PROFESSIONAL"	32	37	57	24	65	09	89	69	69	7.7

BY ART FORM
ART
BY
CATEGORIZED

MUSIC, DANCE THEATRE COMBINED TOTALS	1964/65 1965/66 1966/67 1967/68 1968/69 1969/70 1970/71	786,596 1,790,860 2,074,525 3,652,517 4,354,970 4,873,877 5,596,977 247,215 561,475 721,009 929,844 1,042,852 1,092,839 1,280,795	1,033,811 2,352,335 2,795,534 4,582,361 5,397,822 5,966,716 6,877,772	76 76 74 80 81 82 81		712,383 1,132,366 1,308,000 1,780,100 2,073,712 2,709,088 2,792,231 587,953 659,290 891,501 1,299,543 1,484,366 1,729,450 2,119,726	1,300,336 1,791,656 2,199,501 3,079,643 3,558,078 4,438,538 4,911,957	55 63 60 58 58 61 57		466,563 536,594 679,101 718,357 907,397 1,141,189 1,298,595 199,800 235,409 268,875 253,803 268,964 257,821 292,923	666,363 772,003 947,976 972,160 1,176,361 1,399,010 1,591,518	70 70 71 74 77 82 82		1,965,542 3,459,820 4,061,626 6,150,974 7,336,079 8,724,154 9,687,803 1,034,968 1,456,174 1,881,385 2,483,190 2,796,182 3,080,110 3,693,444	3,000,510 4,915,994 5,943,011 8,634,164 10,132,261 11,804,264 13,381,247	66 70 68 71 72 74 72
OPERA.	1962/63 1963/64	669,400 687,350 325,230 283,083	994,630 970,433	04 49		314,750 625,077 339,363 515,264	654,113 1,140,341	48 55		283,607 325,825 187,809 191,435	471,414 517,260	69 63		1,267,757 1,638,252 852,402 989,782	2,212,057 2,628,034	60 62
	1961/62	646,500	1,049,266	62		221,500	517,046	743		251,825	478,147	52		1,119,825 1,924,634	2,044,459 2,	
	CANADA COUNCIL	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	PROVINCIAL AGENCIES	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	MUNICIPAL ACENCIES	"PROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL GRANTS	"FROFESSIONAL" "NON-PROFESSIONAL"	TOTAL	% "PROFESSIONAL"

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF GRANTS TO PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

CATEGORIZED BY ART FORM

TABLE III

SUMMARY OF ALL GRANTS TO PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

^{*} Includes grants to National Arts Centre.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF TRADITIONAL PERFORMING ARTS SUPPORT BY THE PUBLIC SECTOR WITH L.I.P. AND O.F.Y. PROGRAMMES

A CITIC	OrackA "Professional" "Non-Professional" Total	% PROFESSIONAL % OPERA	MUSIC "Professional" "Non-Professional" Total	% PROFESSIONAL % MUSIC	DANCE "Professional" "Non-Professional" Total	% PROFESSIONAL % DANCE	THEATRE "Professional" "Non-Professional" Total	% PROFESSIONAL % THEATES	TOTAL CALEGORIZED "Professional" "Non-Professional" Total	% PROFESSIONAL	TOTAL TECAMERITATION	COMPOSITE SUPPORT FOR PERFORMING ARTS
Traditional Pattern 1970 - 71	677,500 <u>98,230</u> 775,730	87 6	3,026,925 <u>1,600,958</u> 4,627,883	35	1,522,104 396,650 1,918,754	79	4,461,274 1,597,606 6,058,880	74	9,687,303 3,693,444 13,381,247	72	3,571,103	16,957,350
Opportunities for Youth 1971	38,525 38,525	0 %	226,144 226,144	0 19	54,75 <u>0</u> 54,75 <u>0</u>	0.70	854,265 854,265	73	1,173,684 1,173,684	0	89,150	1,262,834
Local Initiatives Programme 1971 - 72	<u>56,219</u> 56,219	50	269,675 569,675	0 19	23,166 90,141 113,307	20 4	34,170 2,229,729 2,263,899	2	57,336 2,945,764 3,003,100	ત્ય	509,403	3,512,503

TABLE V (A)

CATEGORIZED BY GEOGRAPHIC INFLUENCE

BRITISH COLUMBIA % of Population = 9.4

	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1965/66	1966/67	1967/68	1968/69	1969/70	1970/71
CANADA COUNCIL % OF TOTAL B.C. GRANTS	94,000	116,500	94,500	94,000	199,060	242,500	326,080	473,320	450,700	521,961
PROVINCIAL % OF TOTAL B.C. GRANTS	45,000	71,500	45,750	61,700	73,300	. 86,200	133,657	259,986	312,686	480,815
MUNICIPAL \$ OF'TOTAL B.C. GRANTS	65,275	67,974	78,275	83,921	102,842	122,395	137,198	133,142	114,571	120,553
TOTAL B.C. GRANTS	204,275	255,974	218,525	239,621	375,202	451,095	596,935	8777,998	877,957	1,123,329
B.C. AS % OF ALL GRANTS	10	12	₩	₩	7	7	9	6	9	F-

TABLE V (B)

		12,70261	295,900	2,5	100,688	20		119,200	23		515,788	(e)
		1969/70	232,050	. 05	119,343	26		112,350	57		7463,743	3
		1968/69	176,300	977	97,163	26		105,250	28		378,713	6
		1967/68	123,350	57	56,867	56		38,000	17		218,217	8
		19/9961	63,700	58	34,291	31		12,000	#		106,991	8
	T A 7.3	1965/66	33,800	787	8,227	12		27,840	07		69,867	R
	% of Population	1964/65	20,000	37	11,296	21	,	22,390	77	-	53,686	N
	PS	1963/64	20,000	47	12,319	56		16,000	33		48,319	R
		1962/63	33,500	52	14,978	23		116,300	25		64,778	m
,		1961/62	29,750	56	8,251	15		15,439	53		53,440	W
			CANADA COUNCIL	% OF TOTAL ALBERTA GRANTS	PROVINCIAL .	% OF TOTAL ALBERTA GRANTS		MUNICIPAL	% OF TOTAL ALBERTA GRANTS		TOTAL ALBERTA GRANTS	ALBERTA AS % OF ALL GRANTS

TABLE V (C)

% of Population = 4.8

	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1965/66	1966/67	1967/68	1968/69	1969/70	1970/72
CANADA COUNCIL	8,457	8,500	7,200	7,500	8,000	28,156	24,500	37,270	78,000	80,000
% OF TOTAL SASK, GRANTS	41	38	28	17	77	577	27	23	36	1.77
PROVINCIAL (SASK.ARTS BOARD)	8,895	8,895	11,995	21,856	37,369	81,155	80,372	102,800	66,105	67,250
% OF TOTAL SASK. GRANTS	777	07	26	51	1.9	89	20	79	50	70
MUNICIPAL	3,050	5,050	6,850	13,416	10,550	000 6	10,000	20,000	19,000	22,200
% OF TOTAL SASK. CPANTS	15	22	26	32	19	to	6	13	174	13
TOTAL SASKATCHEWAN GRANTS	20,402	22,445	26,045	42,772	55,919	118,311	114,872	160,070	133,105	169,450
SASKAICHEWAN AS % OF ALL GRANTS	T SIN	Н	Н	Н	Н	R	Ц	Н	П	Н

TABLE V (D)

MANITOBA

	17/07/11	267,040	62	205,286	22	143,775	16	101,916	<i>r</i> C
	1969/70	487,555	61	175,714	22	138,300	17	801,569	₹
	1968/69	450,000	63	142,284	20	125,375	17	717,659	9
	1967/68	369,513	65	140,150	. 22	120,500	19	630,163	9
	1966/67	274,740	53	140,000	27	106,750	20	521,490	60
8.7 = uo	1965/66	256,575	59	93,100	. 21	000,006	. 20	439,675	60
% of Population =	1964/65	110,000	4	63,500	25	77,900	31	251,400	10
86	1963/64	105,500	73	99,000	27	71,025	29	242,525	6
	1962/63	110,500	54	30,750	12	62,000	31	203,250	10
	1961/62	101,500	56	21,000	12	58,000	32	180,500	6
		CANADA COUNCIL	% OF TOTAL MANITOBA GRANTS	PROVINCIAL	% OF TOTAL MANITOBA GRANTS	MUNICIPAL	% OF TOTAL MANITOBA GRANTS	TOTAL MANITOBA GRANTS	MANITOBA AS % OF ALL GRANTS

TARLE V (E)

	1970/71	2,625,000	34	2,183,155	28		4,808,155		2,048,390	27	850,432	11	7,706,977	97
	1969/70	2,500,000	35	2,040,977	29		4,540,977	79	1,652,268	77	845,673	12	7,038,918	947
	1968/69	1,078,000	23	1,928,527	77		3,006,527	65	1,125,445	24	519,359	11	4,651,331	39
	1967/68	1,020,000	27	1,448,982	39		2,468,982	99	929,899	27	251,497	7	3,650,378	36
	1966/67	191,797	11	760,371	73		952,168	24	622,770	35	195,661	11	1,770,599	28
R I 0 tion = 34.8	1965/66	118,868	₩	753,130	67	. 1	871,998	57	7246627	31	193,461	12	1,544,933	53
% of Population =	1964/65	92,680	6.	317,500	31	1	410,180	07	414,600	70	205,334	20	1,030,114	32
	1963/64	ı	0	342,450	77		342,450	7777	298,274	38	141,310	18	782,034	30
	1962/63	1	0	313,800	49		313,800	67	77,000	10	109,290	23	762,090	22
	1961/62	ţ	0	329,534	89		329,534	99	76,000	10	106,408	22	776,942	25
		SECRETARY OF STATE*	% OF TOTAL ONTARIO GRANTS	CANADA COUNCIL	% OF TOTAL ONTARIO GRANTS		TOTAL FEDERAL (SEC. OF STATE AND CANADA COUNCIL)	% OF TOTAL ONTARIO GRANTS	PROVINCIAL	% OF TOTAL ONTARIO. GRANTS	THEOLINA	% OF TOTAL ONTARIO GRANTS	TOTAL ONTARIO GRANTS	ONTARIO AS % OF ALL GRANTS

* Includes National Arts Centre

TABLE V (F)

QUEBEC % of Population = 28.9

1970/71	1,627,658	1	1,942,537	67	778,677	01	3,990,059	. 57
1969/70	1,630,980	39	2,058,922	20	770,000	Ħ	4,129,902	2.7
1968/69	1,449,790	39	1,691,382 · 1,888,326	15	383,000	10	3,721,116	31
1967/68	1,323,058	33		67	770,300	13	3,454,740	34
1966/67	751,500	32	1,105,985	64	497,970	72	2,355,455	. 36
1965/66	585,512	37	817,470	7.4	334,900	19.	1,737,882	33
1964/65	233,000	20	672,684	07	251,042	22	1,156,726	37
1963/64	204,250	20	646,153	63	179,450	17	1,029,853	33
1962/63	214,250	25	730,040	51	206,300	77	850,590	07
1961/62	255,000	31	366,950	6)	225,600	26	847,550	177
	CANADA COUNCIL	% OF TOTAL QUEBEC CRANTS	PROVINGIAL	% OF TOTAL QUEBEC GRAITS	MUNICIPAL	% OF TOTAL QUEBEC GRAMTS	TOTAL QUEBEC GRANTS	QUEBEC AS % OF ALL CRANTS

TABLE V (G)

DETAILS OF GRANTS TO PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

% of Population = 3.1

	,			1	1	2// // 6				
196	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1962/66	7,9/9961	1967/68	1968/69	1969/70	1970,71
CANADA COUNCIL	1	20,000	20,000	18,000	10,000	20,000	19,050	1	15,000	13,500
% OF TOTAL NEW BRUNSWICK GRANTS	0	778	77	73	52	99	52	0	877	31
PROVINCIAL	1,650	1,650	4,850	7,950	7,450	8,450	12,800	24,250	15,450	26,000
% OF TOTAL NEW BRUNSWICK GRANTS 44	4		19	20	39	50	35	₩	67	19
MUNICIPAL 2	2,125	2,250	1,100	1,700	1,700	1,700	4,815	3,235	016	3,510
% OF TOTAL NEW BRUNSWICK GRANTS 56	56	6	7	<i>t</i> -	0	9	13	12	М	₩.
TOTAL NEW BRUNSWICK GRANTS: 3	3,775	23,900	25,950	24,650	19,150	30,150	36,665	27,485	31,360	43,010
NEW BRUNSWICK AS % OF ALL GRANTS	0	Н	Н	ч	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE V (H)

% of Population = 3.8

	1967/68 1968/69 1969/70 1970/71	255,000 124,000 130,800 160,000	65 49 38 39	113,950 . 106,624 173,050 204,178	29 41 50 50	26,550 26,550 41,850 43,250	6 10 12 11	395,500 257,174 345,700 407,428	
	1966/67	150,585 2	897	1,150	75	23,250	£-	317,985	20
0.0	1965/66	107,000	26	290,313	69	23,250	rU.	420,563	€
or robutation - 7.0	1964/65	51,596	07	53,510	27	23,250	to ri	128,356	4
Q	1963/64	76,000	32	65,239	72	33,250	23	144,489	70
	1962/63	35,500	37	53,300	70	8,250	₩	97,050	50
	1961/62	19,000	07	20,300	73	8,250	17	47,550	R
	TI.	CANADA COUNCIL	% OF TOTAL NOVA SCOTIA GRANTS	PROV INCIAL	% OF TOTAL NOVA SCOTIA GRANTS	MUNICIPAL	% OF TOTAL NOVA SCOTIA GRANTS	TOTAL NOVA SCOTIA GRANTS	NOVA SCOTIA AS % OF ALL GRANTS

TABLE V (I)

DETAILS OF GRANTS TO PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

			PRI	N C E	EDWARD Population = .5	ISLAND				
	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1779	1365/66	1966/67	1967/68	1968/69	1969/70	1970/71
SECRETARY OF STATE *	ı	ſ	î	ı	150,000	100,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	225,000
% OF TOTAL P.E.I.GRANTS	0	0	0	0	70,	30	36	37	36	177
CANADA COUNCIL	ſ	8	ı	10,000	59,000	90,000	110,000	115,000	120,000	142,000
% OF TOTAL P.E.I.GRANTS	0	0	0	27	22	28	23	25	24	26
				•	1 1					
TOTAL FEDERAL (SEC.OF STATE										
AND CANADA COUNCIL	1	ł		10,000	209,000	190,000	285,000	290,000	295,000	367,000
% OF TOTAL P.E.I.GRANTS	0	0	0	27	Lila	. 58	59	62	09	19
PROVINCIAL	1,000	1,000	1,000	26,000	61,500	116,500	183,812	162,500	178,500	164,300
% OF TOTAL P.E.I. GRANTS	100	100	100	72	23	35	37	35	37	30
MUNICIPAL	¥	ŧ	ı	300	350	21,050	17,050	17,050	17,050	17,050
% OF TOTAL P.E.I.GRANTS	0	0	0	H	0	7	7	77	W	m
TCTAL P.E.I. GRANTS	1,000	1,000	1,000	36,300	270,850	327,550	785,862	769,550	490,550	548,350
P.E.I. AS % OF ALL GRANTS	0	0	0	Н	20	20	N	7	æ	~
**	* Crossta to Confodorotion	matton Contro	0							

* Grants to Confederation Centre

TABLE V (J)

DETAILS OF GRANTS TO PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

NEWFOUNDLAND % of Population = 2.5

<u>81</u>	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1364/65	1965/66	1966/76	1967/68	1968/69	1969/70	1970/71
CANADA COUNCIL	1	5,000	5,000		1	5,000	5,400	4,074	Ē	3,500
% OF TOTAL NEWFOUNDLAND GRANTS	0	100	100	O: ¢	0	. 100	21	7	0	m
PROVINCIAL *	ŧ	ŧ	1	1	1	1	20,106	98,972	82,878	120,300
% OF TOTAL NEWFOUNDLAND GRANTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	96	100	1.6
MUNICIPAL	i	1	ı	ſ	1	1	ı	ı	ı	ı
% OF TOTAL NEWFOUNDLAND GRANTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL NEWFOUNDLAND GRANTS	ı	5,000	5,000	1	1	5,000	25,506	103,046	82,878	123,800
NEWFOUNDLAND AS % OF ALL GRANTS .0	0.	0	0	0	0	0	0	н	H	Н

* Newfoundland Arts & Culture Centres

TABLE V (K)

PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL

NATIONAL OR UNDEFINED

1970/71	125,000	6	1,283,058	91.	1,408,058 8 16,952,350
1969/70	68,000	100	813,254	92	443,982 647,428 773,041 881,254 1,408,058 7 6 6,448,608 10,256,266 12,125,633 15,276,936 16,952,350
1968/69	83,500	11	689,541	89	647,428 773,041 6 6 10,256,266 12,125,633
1967/68	70,000	Ħ	527,428		647,428 6 10,256,266
1966/67	35,000	₩	786,807	92	
1965/66	ı	0	340,258	100	340,258
1964/65	ı	0	172,215	100	172,215 6 3,135,840
1963/64	ſ	0	130,533	100	130,533
1962/63	1	0	137,080	100	212,325 137,080 10 6 2,055,459 2,128,157
1961/62	ı	0	212,025	100	212,025 10 2,055,459
	SECRETARY OF STATE	% OF TOTAL NATIONAL	CANADA COUNCIL	% OF TOTAL NATIONAL	TOTAL NATIONAL OR UNDEFINED % OF LOTAL TOTAL OF ALL GRANTS

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF GRANTS TO PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

CATEGORIZED BY REGIONAL INFLUENCE

	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1965/66	1966/67	1967/68	1968/69	1969/70	17/07/11
BRITISH COLUMBIA (28.9% of Population)	204,275	255,974	218,525	239,621	375,202	451,095	596,935	866,448	877,957	1,123,329
% of TOTAL	Ħ	13	6	100	t0	7	9	60	9	7
PRAIRIE PROVINCES (16.% of Population)	254,342	290,473	316,889	347,858	565,461	749,792	963,252	1,256,442	1,398,417	1,601,339
% of TOTAL	77	15	122	12	. 12	13	10	11	10	10
ONTARIO (34.8% of Population)	276 ° 1787	767,090	782,034	1,030,114	1,544,933	1,770,599	3,650,378	4,651,331	7,038,918	7,705,977
% of TOTAL	26	23	31	35	31	30	38	17	877	67
CUESEC (28.% of Population)	847,550	\$50,590	1,029,853	1,156,726	1,737,882	2,355,455	3,454,740	3,721,116	4,129,902	3,990,059
% of TCTAL	97	73	17	39	35	39	36	32	29	56
ATLA TIC (1) (9.9% of Population)	52,325	126,950	176,439	189,306	710,563	677,685	943,533	972,255	1,075,488	1,292,588
% of Total	6	9	7	9	7	#	10	₩	7	₩
TOTAL REGIONAL (2)	1,843,434 1,991,077	1,991,077	2,523,740	2,963,625	4,934,041	6,004,626	9,608,838	11,467,592	14,520,682	15,714,292
% of TOTAL	100	001	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

NOTES: (1) Includes grants to Atlantic Symphony, previously classified as "National or Undefined".
(2) Excludes grants classified as "National or Undefined".
(3) Disregards N.W.T. and Yukon with .21% population.

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF TRADITIONAL SUPPORT WITH L.I.P. AND O.F.Y. PROGRAMMES

Local Initiatives Programme 1971 - 72 759,651	22.5	875,84	iC.	ſ		130,737	7.0	1,091,474	32.5	1,132,789	33.5	71,389	2.0	126,363	3.5	16,845	ň	t	1	3,377,796	134,707	3,512,503
Opportunities for Youth 1971 143,095	11.5	77,493	3.5	67,884	بر. بر.	25,290.	2.0	393,688	31.0	406,396	32.0	37,778	3.0	78,275	0.9	57,655	4.5	8,280	1.0	1,262,834		1,262,834
Traditional pattern 1970 - 71	7.0	515,788	3.5	169,450	1.0	916,101	0.9	7,706,977	49.5	3,990,059	25.5	010,64	, ·	\$77,407	2,5	548,350	ال ال	123,800	1.0	15,544,292	1,408,058	16,952,350
BRITISH COLUMBIA (% of Powiletton=9.4)	% of TOTAL	ALBERTA (% of Pomilation=7.3)	% of TOTAL	SASKATCHEWAN	% of TOTAL	(% of Pomilation=/ &)	% of TOTAL	ONTARIO (% of Pomilation=34.8)	% of TOTAL	CLEBEC (% of Population=28.9)	% of TOTAL	NEW BRUNSWICK (% of Population=3.1)	% of Total	NOVA SCOTIA (% of Population=3.8)	% of TOTAL	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (% of topulation= .5)	% of TOTAL	NEWFOUNDIAND (% of Pomilation=2.5)		TOTAL % of TOTAL	NATIONAL OR UNDEFINED	GRAND TOTAL

TABLE VIII

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC AND PRINKE CHANTS

TO PERFORMING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS

	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1965/66	1966/67	1967/68	1968/69	1969/70	1970/71
FEDERAL	1,049,266	069,466	975,433	1,126,491	2,621,203	3,122,331	5,847,361	6,784,372	8,712,316	9,852,772
% OF TOTAL	36	31	57	24	37	36	1.77	97	877	67
PROVINCIAL	522,046	656,113	1,151,580	1,330,096	1,868,203	2,336,501	3,362,995	4,008,350	4,834,916	5,359,744
% OF TOTAL	18	21	29	55	56	27	27	27	56	27
MUNICIPAL	777,774	477,414	527,260	679,254	784,893	989,776	989,776 1,045,910	1,332,961	1,729,704	1,739,834
% OF TOTAL	16	15	13	15	# .	Ħ·	6 0	6	6	6
ALL PRIVATE *	875,000	1,050,000	1,375,000	1,560,000	1,875,000	2.251,000	2,205,000	2,666,000	3,080,000	3,044,000
% OF TOTAL	30	33	37	33	56	56	18	18	17	15
TOTAL, PUBLIC&PRIVATE *	2,930,459	3,178,157	4,029,273	4,695,841	7,149,299	8,699,608	12,461,266	14,791,683	18,356,936	19,996,350
% OF TOTAL	100	100	100	100	001.	100 100	100	100	100	100

* Estimated

TABLE IX

CALCULATIONS FOR CORPORATE SUPPORT OF PERFORMING ARTS

	1961/62	1962/63	1963/64	1964/65	1965/66	1966/67	1967/68	1968/69	1969/70	1970/71
TOTAL CORPORATE DONATIONS (1) (\$ millions)	38.1	39.8	7.17	46.2	. 4.49	64.3	0°69	73.2	70.2	70
PERFORMING ARTS OPERATING SUPPORT (% of ABOVE)	1.4	7.1	7.7	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.9	2.2
ESTIMATED CORPORATE OPERATING SUPPORT (\$ millions)	£.	.56	.59	. 65	16.	96°	1.10	1.25	1.33	1.55
TOTAL PRIVATE PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT (\$ millions)	.700	078.	1.100	1.250	1.500	1.801	1.765	2.136	2.460	2.434
PRIVATE: NON-PROFESSIONAL (\$ millions)	. 175	.210	.275	, 310	.375	.450	0777.	.530	.620	.610
TOTAL ESTIMATED PRIVATE SUPPORT (\$ millions)	875	1.050	1.375	1.560	1.875	2.251	2.205	2,666	3.080	3.044
CAPIOPALE SUPPOSE (AS % OF TOTAL PRIVATE)	09	54	73	77	67	73	50	47	73	T
OCREGACE OF PORTIC & PRIVATE) 18	18	13	15	77	13	11	σ	₩	7	10

Sources - 1961/62 to 1964/65 Taxation Statistics, Dept. of National Revenue - 1965/66, 1966/67, 1968/69, 1969/70 Corporate Financial Statistics, D.B.S. - 1967/68, 1970/71 - Estimates 7 Notes:

(2) Source - Estimates from Conference Board Survey, assuming performing arts comprise 75% of corporate cultural donations.

TABLE X.
PROJECTION OF PERFORMING ARTS SUPPORT

	1970/71	21/12	1972/73	1973/74	1974/75
SECRETARY OF STATE AND NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE	2,975	3,600	4,200	4,800	5,400
% of TOTAL	15	16	16	16	16
PROVINCES	5,360	6,200	7,000	7,900	8,800
% of TOTAL	27	27	27	27	27
MUNICIPAL	1,740	2,000	2,250	2,550	2,900
% of TOTAL	₩	6		6	6
PRIVATE	3,044	3,300	3,500	3,650	3,800
% of TOTAL	15	. 77	13	13	12
SUBTOTAL	13,119	15,100	16,950	18,900	20,900
% of TOTAL	65	99	65	65	79
TOTAL SUPPORT REQUIRED	19,997	23,000	26,000	29,000	32,500
% of TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100
CANADA COUNCIL SUPPORT REQUIRED	6,878	7,900	9,050	10,100	11,600
% of TOTAL	35	34	35	35	·36

APPENDIX C

























